

Maud Collier to be postmaster at Pelly, Tex., in place of Maud Collier. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1938.

Daniel J. Quill to be postmaster at San Antonio, Tex., in place of D. J. Quill. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1939.

## VERMONT

Ernest A. Naylor to be postmaster at Alburg, Vt., in place of E. A. Naylor. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1938.

Peter E. Kehoe to be postmaster at West Pawlet, Vt., in place of P. E. Kehoe. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1938.

## VIRGINIA

Elizabeth P. White to be postmaster at Sandston, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1937.

## WASHINGTON

Pearl G. M. Johnson to be postmaster at Mercer Island, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

Eudocia B. Leech to be postmaster at Steilacoom, Wash., in place of E. B. Leech. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1938.

## WISCONSIN

Vincent J. Dwyer to be postmaster at Alma Center, Wis., in place of V. J. Dwyer. Incumbent's commission expired June 15, 1938.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 16, 1939*

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

James V. Allred to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas.

Frank A. Picard to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia.

## UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Alex Smith to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama.

James H. Patterson to be United States marshal for the third division of the Territory of Alaska.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O changeless One, life's guide and spiritual goal, stimulate our thoughts with the blessedness of the riches of Thy goodness, mercy, love, and pity. May all hearts be joined together in the common love of our common Father and grant that all laws and institutions may feel Thy presence. O gather into Thy encircling arms and soft mothering bosom the sick in all homes and in all institutions. Be the angel of light and hope upon their immortal souls like dawn upon the hills of earth. Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hess, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and a bill of the House of the following titles:

On February 4, 1939:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

On February 10, 1939:

H. R. 2762. An act to consolidate and codify the internal revenue laws of the United States.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

FEBRUARY 15, 1939.

The SPEAKER,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The certificate of election, in due form of law, of Hon. LANSDALE G. SASSCER as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-sixth Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Maryland, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Stephen W. Gambrill, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

## SWEARING-IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. SASSCER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 53, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission the following Members of the House to fill existing vacancies thereon: Mr. McGRANERY, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. DARROW, of Pennsylvania.

## GOLDEN GATE INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, on next Saturday at noon the Golden Gate International Exposition will open its gates to the world. It is my distinguished privilege, as the Representative of the district in which it has been built, to extend to all of the Members of Congress a most cordial invitation to visit this great exposition.

Those of you who attended the last world's fair held in San Francisco—the Panama-Pacific Exposition of 1915—all retain, I am sure, memories of its rare beauty and charm. San Francisco assures you that its new exposition will be a worthy successor to that dream city of the past.

The 1915 fair commemorated the completion of the Panama Canal, the miracle of engineering which linked the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The 1939 exposition celebrates two new engineering miracles, the great bridges spanning San Francisco Bay, each the largest of its type in the world.

The site of the exposition is an artificial island, built in the center of the bay, between the two bridges. It has been christened Treasure Island, and upon it there stands today a spectacular city of exhibit palaces, surrounded by beautiful gardens and trees of every species.

The people of San Francisco are grateful to the Congress of the United States for its generous appropriation for the Federal Building and exhibit, which will be one of the most attractive features of the exposition. And they are extremely anxious that the Members of Congress shall see for themselves the good use to which this money has been put.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Buck] and I will leave here by plane this afternoon to attend the opening of the exposition. We would like to take all of the Members of the House with us, but, regretting that this is an impossibility, we shall carry with us instead, by your leave, the greetings and good wishes of Congress to the people of California, assembled by the Golden Gate.

The exposition will continue until December 2, 1939. It is styled "A Pageant of the Pacific." Eleven Western States of America are its sponsors, with the San Francisco Bay area as host community, and more than 30 foreign nations par-

ticipating. Its designers have built a compact world's fair, stressing beauty and glamour rather than size, and have taken every advantage of Treasure Island's unique setting in the center of a great harbor.

Here stand the two wonder bridges of the world—the \$80,000,000 San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, longest and most costly anywhere; and the \$33,000,000 Golden Gate Bridge, crossing the harbor entrance with the longest single span ever created.

Over these two steel structures huge clipper ships fly on schedule to the Orient, bringing distant Asia within days, not weeks, of America. This ocean air service has accelerated the tempo of trade intercourse with the Orient, just as the bridges have unified the San Francisco Bay area.

The Golden Gate International Exposition will be a travel fair, assembling the vacation resources of the Pacific slope and displaying them as a rich background for the industrial progress that makes them more easily available.

With the western fair established as a travel fair, the 11 Western States gave it their enthusiastic cosponsorship, wiping out sectional lines. Foreign nations were quick to join, so that the close of 1938 found all but three of the South and Central American nations, and every Pacific country except Russia, China, and British Malaya pledged to participate.

The Federal Government is represented by a stately building and comprehensive national exhibits, with George Creel, nationally known writer, as commissioner in charge. The 7-acre building, costing \$600,000, faces the Court of the Nation, where ceremonies, concerts, army maneuvers, and pageantry will be held.

The Government's \$1,500,000 display, first of its kind ever undertaken, will be unique in the history of Government participation in expositions. Instead of a jumbled mess of dull pictures and duller charts, the United States commission for the exposition has endeavored to present a dramatized and interesting story of how our Government works and to show the taxpayer how his dollar is spent.

Seven major themes were selected for the backbone of the exhibit. These will treat social welfare, national defense, conservation, housing, science, economic affairs, and Indian life. Each Federal agency was called upon to coordinate with each other Federal agency in presenting the exhibit. Motion pictures, puppets, sound effects, and animated devices will be used effectively to dramatize this first all-inclusive governmental exhibit.

Hawaii occupies 21,000 square feet in the Pacific Basin, with a pavilion typical of Polynesian life. The Netherlands East Indies has erected a spacious pavilion, redolent of the atmosphere of the "Spice Islands" and decorated by bas-reliefs copied from famed ruins of Borobodoer and ancient jungle temples. Norway's building faithfully reproduces a Norwegian ski lodge, and Japan's medieval castle, representative of Nipponese tradition, stresses the cultural, industrial, and tourist sides of Japanese life.

Johore is in a replica of the Johore Dewan, or council house, with a display featuring tourism and big-game hunting. French Indochina's two-story building, fabricated in Saigon and shipped in sections, was the first foreign building to reach Treasure Island. France has built an elaborate pavilion for a display of arts, crafts, de luxe trades, and travel. New Zealand's building bears the facade of a Maori house; Costa Rica, in striking contrast, has a coffee plantation.

The Philippine Commonwealth has a Spanish colonial pavilion with a 100-foot tower; Australia's pavilion presents the unusual flora and fauna found "down under," and Peru's building traces the roots of modern civilization back to the Incas. Italy's elaborate buildings stress the arts, cultures, and industries, and Brazil's pavilion combines the cultural and commercial attractions. Argentina's building is modernistic, and Chile chose a pavilion of native design. El Salvador's building will combine a tourist, agricultural, and commercial display.

Other nations exhibiting in their own buildings include Guatemala, Ecuador, Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama. Alaska, an outlying Territory, is also included in

this group. In the International Hall, one of the main palaces, the list of foreign countries which have exhibits include Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Sweden, Rumania, Belgium, Portugal, Turkey, Hungary, Holland, Bulgaria, and Greece. British Columbia, although a foreign governmental unit, will exhibit in the Hall of Western States.

California's appropriation of \$5,000,000 for the story of the Golden State was a major factor in enlisting the aid and support of her sister States. Seventeen big buildings, plus active participation in affairs at many points on Treasure Island, are required to tell this story. The climax building of the State group is the California Hospitality Building, and surrounding it are 10 others dedicated to groups of California's 58 counties. These include structures for the Redwood Empire, Mission Trails counties, Shasta-Cascade, Alameda-Contra Costa, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Sacramento Valley-Mountain, San Joaquin, southern California, and Alta California counties.

In addition to Government and State participation, more than 250 outstanding American industries, have exhibit space on Treasure Island. Their buildings or displays in the great exhibit halls radiate from the Tower of the Sun. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California, Mr. Buck, has requested me to ask unanimous consent that he may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two tables of official figures and two brief paragraphs from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### CITY OF ST. LOUIS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, 175 years ago, to be exact, either February 14 or 15, 1764, Auguste Chouteau, accompanied by a party of 30, reached a site on the Mississippi River that Pierre Laclède had selected about 2 months before and founded the city of St. Louis, now the second largest city of the United States west of the Mississippi River.

History tells us Pierre Laclède was at the head of the last colonial expedition that left New Orleans, which was in August 1763. His objective was to locate a trading post near the mouth of the Missouri River. When he decided this trading post should be located at what is now in the center of the eastern boundary of St. Louis, he said in time it "might become hereafter, one of the finest cities in America." This prediction has come true.

Mr. Speaker, in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Tuesday, February 14 is a short article depicting the founding of St. Louis. Under permission granted me by the House I include that article as part of my remarks. The article follows:

TODAY IS ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ST. LOUIS—CITY WAS ORIGINALLY CALLED "PAINCOURT," WHICH IS FRENCH FOR "SHORT OF BREAD"

The little village of "Paincourt" is 175 years old this week. "Paincourt" was founded in February 1764 and is better known as St. Louis. But the old French called it "Paincourt"—French for "short of bread" and a sly dig at the first St. Louis fur traders, who were too busy making money to grow wheat and had to bring in their groceries from Ste. Genevieve.

The birthday is either February 14 or 15. Thirty brawny Frenchmen fathered Paincourt-St. Louis. On a February evening 175 years ago they landed at a little cove in the river at the foot of Walnut Street and climbed a little gully to a spot where Pierre Laclède, 2 months before, had blazed some walnut trees to mark the site. The next morning, the 30 men started to clear the ground and build a shack.

Auguste Chouteau, 14-year-old boy who bossed the clearing of the walnut trees on Second Street, wrote down the date in a journal when he was an old man. That journal is the only firsthand evidence about the first days in St. Louis. But Chouteau was tired or hurried when he put down the date. He wrote "février (February) 1" and then a scrawl after the 1 which may be a 4 or 5. To make it worse, he or someone else later wrote "mars" (March) over the "février."



## UP THE RIVER

Other evidence rules out the date in March. Laclede sent Chouteau up the river from Fort Chartres, near the present Chester, Ill., as early as weather permitted—probably in February. Chouteau, 45 years afterward, told the recorder of deeds he left Chartres February 10 and arrived in St. Louis February 15. Gabriel Chouteau, his second son, wrote in 1882 that "my father came to the place where St. Louis now stands, February 14, 1764." In 1847 the anniversary was celebrated on February 15. The first translation of the Chouteau journal from French into English in 1858 rendered the date the 14th.

A man, a woman, and a boy! According to an old saying, no great thing is ever done without a man in the front, a boy at his side, and a woman in the background. It was so at the founding of St. Louis.

Pierre Laclede was born near Pau, France, in the Pyrenees mountain country along the Spanish border, in 1724. He came of a good family, lawyers and professional men. His elder brother was a government official. But Pierre wanted to seek his fortune in the New World.

He was 26 when he landed at New Orleans. He could speak and write Spanish, a valued talent in a many-languaged city. He was good looking and democratic. He had a serious side. Soon he was known as a popular young bachelor in New Orleans social circles.

On a summer day in the old square or on a semitropical night in some Creole garden he met a young woman. She was Mme. Marie Therese Bourgeois Chouteau. She had been married to a Rene Auguste Chouteau when she was 15 and had one son, Auguste Chouteau. She was just past 20. She and Laclede fell in love.

They were the man and the woman.

In 1760 the wilderness stretched north from New Orleans to Canada. On paper it belonged to the King of France. It was marsh, forest, and prairie. A few savages stamped around on what is now downtown Cleveland, Chicago, Minneapolis, Omaha, and Kansas City.

Marquette and La Salle had canoed across the Great Lakes from Canada and paddled down the Mississippi River. A few missionary priests came down from Quebec and founded mission stations at Cahokia, Kaskaskia, and Vincennes. A French fort was built at Chartres to keep off the Spanish from Santa Fe, N. Mex. There was a lead mine at Ste. Genevieve. The rest of the Mississippi country was like the Congo in Africa.

## FUR APLENTY

But there was fur in the Mississippi country like the ivory on the Congo. A good man could make money in the wilderness. The redskins traded furs in for hardware and beads; the same furs brought high prices in Paris and London.

That was why Laclede and Col. Antoine Maxent, leading New Orleans merchant, organized a new syndicate in 1762. The Acting Governor General of Louisiana gave them exclusive trading rights in the Missouri River Valley. Maxent furnished the capital and political connections. Laclede was field executive. In that capacity he started up the river on August 3, 1763, to establish a trading post at or near the mouth of the Missouri River. Young Auguste Chouteau was with him.

The trip was in river boats—apparently cordelle boats. When there was a south wind, these low-huller barges sailed upstream. When there was a north wind, the crews got out and walked along the bank and pulled the boats behind them.

It was the last fleet sent out by France to found a great city in the New World. Quebec, Montreal, Detroit, New Orleans, and now St. Louis. Before the departure, Laclede learned the east bank of the Mississippi had just been ceded by France to England in the treaty which closed the Seven Years War. So his settlement would have to be on the west shore to be in France. He did not know France had secretly conveyed Louisiana, or the west shore, to Spain and that there was no more France in the New World.

Atop a pile of baggage on one of the cordelle boats sat young Auguste Chouteau.

He was the son of Rene Auguste Chouteau and Mme. Chouteau and was a baby when Laclede and his mother met in New Orleans. Laclede won the baby's heart as well as the mother's.

Now, at 14, he was first lieutenant of the expedition. It was to fall to him to be boss of the party which actually founded the city.

He was the boy.

Here is the English translation of the journal he wrote afterward. The "he" is Laclede:

"He occupied himself (this is the English translation) with the means of forming an establishment suitable for commerce, Ste. Genevieve not suiting him because of its distance from the Missouri and its insalubrious situation. These reasons decided him to seek a more advantageous site. In consequence, he set out from Fort de Chartres in the month of December, took with him a young man in his confidence (Chouteau), and examined all the ground from the Fort de Chartres to the Missouri.

"He was delighted to see the situation where St. Louis at present stands; he did not hesitate a moment to form there the establishment that he proposed. Besides the beauty of the site, he found there all the advantages that one could desire to found a settlement which might become very considerable hereafter. After having examined all thoroughly, he fixed upon the place where he wished to form his settlement, marked with his own hand some trees, and said to Chouteau, 'You will come here as soon as naviga-

tion opens and will cause this place to be cleared in order to form our settlement after the plan that I shall give you.' We set out immediately afterward to return to Fort de Chartres, where he said with enthusiasm to Monsieur de Neyon and to his officers, that he had found a situation where he was going to form a settlement which might become hereafter one of the finest cities of America; so many advantages were embraced in this site by its locality and its central position for forming settlements. \* \* \*

"Navigation being open in the early part of February, he fitted out a boat, in which he put 30 men, nearly all mechanics, and he gave the charge of it to Chouteau, and said to him: 'You will proceed and land at the place where we marked the trees; you will commence to have the place cleared, and build a large shed to contain the provisions and the tools, and small cabins to lodge the men \* \* \*. I arrived at the place designated on the (here follows the controversial date of the founding of the city), and on the morning of the next day I put the men to work. They commenced the shed, which was built in a short time, and the little cabins for the men were built in the vicinity.

"In the early part of April, Laclede arrived among us. He occupied himself with his settlement, fixed the place where he wished to build his house, laid a plan of the village which he wished to found, and he named it St. Louis, in honor of Louis XV, whose subject he expected to remain for a long time; he never imagined he was a subject of the King of Spain; and ordered me to follow the plan exactly because he could not remain any longer with us. He was obliged to proceed to Fort de Chartres to remove the goods that he had in the fort before the arrival of the English. \* \* \* I followed to the best of my ability his plan and used the utmost diligence to accelerate the building of the house."

Mme. Chouteau joined Laclede and her son at the new village in the autumn. A carter drove her north from Kaskaskia to Cahokia. Laclede rode beside the wagon on horseback.

So a man, woman, and boy founded St. Louis.

## COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—OFFICES ABROAD IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation designed to authorize the payment of burial expenses and expenses in connection with last illness and death of native employees who die while serving in offices abroad of executive departments of the United States Government.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 16, 1939.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—WATER-POLLUTION CONTROL (H. DOC. NO. 155)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The last Congress recognized the national importance of pollution abatement in our streams and lakes by passing, during its closing days, an act providing for the creation of a Division of Water Pollution Control in the United States Public Health Service and for the establishment of a permanent system of Federal grants-in-aid and loans to assist in constructing pollution-abatement projects. Although fully subscribing to the general purposes of that act, I felt compelled to withhold my approval of it because of the method which it provided for the authorization of loans and grants-in-aid. It would have prevented the consideration of such appropriations as a part of the annual Budget for all purposes. My reasons are set forth in detail in my memoran-

dum of June 25, 1938. I hope that at this session the whole problem of water pollution may again receive your attention.

To facilitate study of the problem by the Congress, I am transmitting a report on Water Pollution in the United States, which outlines the status of pollution, the cost of bringing about a reasonable degree of abatement, and the financial, technical, and administrative aspects of such a program. The document was prepared at my request by a special advisory committee of the National Resources Committee composed of representative experts from the Departments of War, Treasury, the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from private and State agencies.

No quick and easy solution of these problems is in sight. The committee estimates that an expenditure by public and private agencies of approximately \$2,000,000,000 over a period of 10 to 20 years may be required to construct works necessary to abate the more objectional pollution. Inasmuch as the needed works are chiefly treatment plants for municipal sewage and industrial waste, the responsibility for them rests primarily with municipal government and private industry. Much construction work is in progress. Many State agencies have forced remedial action where basic studies have shown it to be practicable.

Unprecedented advances in cleaning up our streams have been made possible by the public works and work relief programs during the past 6 years. The report states that more progress has been made in abatement of municipal waste during that period than during the entire 25 years preceding, chiefly as a result of Federal financial stimulation. As in many other fields of conservation, great improvement in the Nation's basic assets of water has been incident to the fight against unemployment. If this construction work is to continue at a substantial rate, and if the necessary research, education, and enforcement activities are to be carried out most effectively, the Federal Government must lend financial support and technical stimulation.

It is my opinion that pending further experimentation with interstate and State enforcement activities, Federal participation in pollution-abatement should take the general form of establishing a central technical agency to promote and coordinate education, research, and enforcement. On the basis of recent experience, it should be supplemented by a system of Federal grants-in-aid and loans organized with due regard for the integrated use and control of water resources, and for a balanced Federal program for public works of all types. The time is overdue for the Federal Government to take vigorous leadership along these lines.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 15, 1939.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—NATIONAL ENERGY RESOURCES (H. DOC. NO. 160)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following further message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with my request of March 15, 1938, the National Resources Committee, in consultation with the other Federal agencies concerned, has prepared a comprehensive study of our energy resources, which I present herewith for your consideration.

This report represents the joint effort of many specialists both within and outside the Federal Government. It suggests policies, investigations, and legislation necessary to carry forward a broad national program for the prudent utilization and conservation of the Nation's energy resources.

Our resources of coal, oil, gas, and water power provide the energy to turn the wheels of industry, to service our homes, and to aid in national defense. We now use more energy per capita than any other people, and our scientists tell us there will be a progressively increasing demand for energy for all purposes.

Our energy resources are not inexhaustible, yet we are permitting waste in their use and production. In some instances,

to achieve apparent economies today future generations will be forced to carry the burden of unnecessarily high costs and to substitute inferior fuels for particular purposes. National policies concerning these vital resources must recognize the availability of all of them; the location of each with respect to its markets; the costs of transporting them; the technological developments which will increase the efficiency of their production and use; the use of the lower grade coals; and the relationships between the increased use of energy and the general economic development of the country.

In the past the Federal Government and the States have undertaken various measures to conserve our heritage in these resources. In general, however, each of these efforts has been directed toward the problems in a single field: toward the protection of the public interest in the power of flowing water in the Nation's rivers; toward the relief of economic and human distress in the mining of coal; or toward the correction of demoralizing and wasteful practices and conditions in the industries producing oil and natural gas. It is time now to take a larger view; to recognize—more fully than has been possible or perhaps needful in the past—that each of our great natural resources of energy affects the others.

It is difficult in the long run to envisage a national coal policy, or a national petroleum policy, or a national water-power policy without also in time a national policy directed toward all of these energy producers—that is, a national energy resources policy. Such a broader and integrated policy toward the problems of coal, petroleum, natural gas, and water power cannot be evolved overnight.

The widening interest and responsibility on the part of the Federal Government for the conservation and wise use of the Nation's energy resources raises many perplexing questions of policy determination. Clearly, there must be adequate and continuing planning and provision for studies which will reflect the best technical experience available, as well as full consideration for both regional and group interests.

Some Federal legislation affecting the energy resources will expire at the end of this fiscal year, other legislation at the end of a few more years. This report sets forth a useful frame of reference for legislative programs affecting these resources and illustrate another approach to the systematic husbandry of our natural resources. Specific recommendations are advanced for solution of the most pressing problems.

In order to facilitate its use by the Congress, I recommend that this report be printed together with supporting staff reports and illustrations, when these are available in final form, in conformity with similar reports prepared by the National Resources Committee.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 15, 1939.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey, Mr. LEMKE, and Mr. REES of Kansas asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered last night in connection with memorial services for Susan B. Anthony.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Joseph P. Lash on the 27th day of December 1938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Secretary of the Interior on the subject of conservation of grazing in our national parks.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

Mr. RABAUT, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4218) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 43), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEFAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1940; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day, one half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4218; and pending that motion, asks unanimous consent that the general debate on the bill run throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Nebraska. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the information of the minority, I would like to ask the majority member on this committee when we may expect to start reading the bill for amendment—about 2 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why?

Mr. STEFAN. We have considerable requests for time, I may say to the majority leader. There are a number of Members who want to speak.

Mr. RAYBURN. Tomorrow?

Mr. STEFAN. I have requests for 3 or 4 hours, although I know we cannot give them that much time.

Mr. RAYBURN. We will complete the consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. STEFAN. It is intended, I understand, to complete the consideration of the bill tomorrow; yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. If we have a late session tomorrow to read the bill, the 2 hours taken in general debate tomorrow will certainly be responsible for it.

Mr. STEFAN. I think it is generally understood we are going to complete the consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. RAYBURN. We are.

Mr. STEFAN. It should not take over one-half hour or 45 minutes to read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4218) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes. Mr. Chairman, we have before us the legislative establishment appropriation bill for 1940. In 1939 the appropriation in this bill was \$22,210,883. The Budget estimate for 1940 was \$24,287,946. There is recommended in this bill \$21,636,398. We are under the 1939 appropriation by the sum of \$574,485 and under the Budget estimate by \$2,651,548.

The high spots of this bill dealing with many departments on Capitol Hill, I will take up one by one, starting with the items under the caption of "Architect of the Capitol." It came as a distinct surprise to the committee to learn that

the two roofs, the one over the House side and the one over the Senate side, are not in the very best condition. These roofs have been on this building for a period of 85 years.

The roofs have been subject to strain and fatigue. The committee had an exhaustive study made concerning this very important matter. It is estimated that to replace these roofs will cost approximately \$585,000. It came as a surprise to the members of the committee to learn that even the ceiling in this room is cast iron, all the structural braces in the roof are cast iron, and this is dealing with an entirely different material than would be employed in constructing roofs today. The ordinary load of a roof is estimated to be 30 pounds to the square foot, but a roof is always built to carry four times that estimated load.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I understand that the roofs on the House and Senate wings of the Capitol were constructed about 85 years ago; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. Has the committee made sufficient investigation to determine how imminent any danger may be from the present condition of these roofs?

Mr. RABAUT. I intend to develop that as I go along.

Mr. LANHAM. And another thing, if the gentleman will touch upon this, my recollection is this bill provides an appropriation of \$585,000 for the purpose of renewing these roofs. What has been done to arrive at that sum? Upon what is that estimate predicated and has there been an inspection of the roofs by experts to determine accurately just what should be done and what the reasonable cost would be?

Mr. RABAUT. I will be very pleased to develop that subject for the gentleman from Texas.

The matter of the condition of the roofs was discovered when the roofs were being examined for the purpose of making them fireproof, and when the anticipated load of fireproofing the roofs was contemplated and the structure was studied, it was found they would not only not take the fireproofing, but they were in danger from their own weight, according to present-day standards.

As I was saying when the gentleman asked me the question, the ordinary roof load is figured in modern engineering to carry four times the required amount of 30 pounds to the square foot. The roof over the Capitol is about 50 percent efficient. It developed in the hearings that there were certain strains on the pins that hold up the structural part of this roof. It developed that the regular strain on these pins, which should be in the neighborhood of 12,000 pounds to a certain unit, are strained to the point of something like 77,000 pounds, and that the roof of itself under ordinary conditions is safe, but the roof would not be safe with tremendous snow, followed by rain, turning to ice with changing temperature. In such case it developed in the hearings we would be very wise to step out of the structure.

It is also true that prominent roofs that have collapsed have been new roofs, the collapse being due to faulty construction, but it is also true there is no roof in existence today of this size, built in this style, any place that is known of that was built in the same period, of the same type of materials.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. I wonder if in case of heavy snow, to which the gentleman has referred, it would be possible to remove the snow and thus prevent that danger?

Mr. RABAUT. Something would have to be done under the information that has been given the members of the committee. They would probably employ live steam.

Mr. MAHON. But the gentleman does not feel there is any immediate danger of collapse which should cause the House any alarm?

Mr. RABAUT. No; and I do not think the public should be alarmed, but I feel it would be well to take the precaution that has been suggested to us.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. I was here when the Knickerbocker disaster occurred and that was something that struck the hearts of all of us, because it resulted in great loss of life. We have now a roof on this building which has lasted 85 years. Is it proposed to put a roof on today that will last that long again?

Mr. RABAUT. I made a remark in committee that perhaps the members ought to take a course in engineering. I am not able to say anything about that except as the evidence that was given the laymen on the committee by experts, including engineers from the National Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and the Procurement Division, and the famous engineer Mr. Thomas W. Marshall, all of the others agreeing with a letter that he sent to the Architect of the Capitol, saying that fatigue and strain and undetected faults that may be in the roof are something that the committee and the Congress should absolutely take notice of, and this testimony is backed up by the gentlemen from the departments to whom I have just referred.

Mr. LANHAM. I should say to the gentleman that beside the question of safety, the preservation of the Capitol, and proper care are absolutely imperative, when needed, because, in my judgment, there is no more beautiful building in all the world. When will this repair be made?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the gentleman's great interest in the Capitol and of his profound knowledge of its history. It is as disturbing to the members of our committee as it is, evidently, to the gentleman from Texas today. This morning before the full Committee on Appropriations it was decided that inasmuch as nothing can be done with the building while we are in session, further time should be given to the committee to conduct a further study, and that an amount of \$5,000 should be appropriated to secure additional advice from engineers. If the work is to be done, it will have to be done while Congress is not in session, and it will be necessary to work at least two shifts to get it ready before the Congress returns.

Mr. LANHAM. The evidence before the committee was that an abnormally large and heavy snowstorm would endanger the safety of the building?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; and there is extensive testimony in the hearings about that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. To tell the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that our information is that in case we have a 30-inch fall of snow on this roof, we will have instructions to move out, and this committee went on record, which would indicate that we feel something should be done immediately to safeguard the lives of the Members who are in the House and our visitors in the galleries.

Mr. LANHAM. I am quite in sympathy with that, and also that the proper precaution for the preservation of the Capitol should be taken. I am simply trying by my inquiries to elicit information as to the imminent or emergency nature of the condition here and what should be done right away. Personally, I am in favor of doing whatever is necessary to be done.

Mr. STEFAN. Throughout the hearings and our interrogation of witnesses before the committee, we made it very plain that nothing should be done here which would injure or destroy or eliminate any of the valuable American architecture that is present in this Capitol, which the gentleman has fought to preserve.

Mr. LANHAM. In addition to that, is it true that the plans in prospect do not contemplate any architectural changes, but merely the matter of replacing the roof as a matter of safety?

Mr. STEFAN. Insofar as the roofs are concerned, but I warn my colleague that there are plans on foot today to change the appearance of this valuable building; that is, to move the front of the Capitol out to match with the House

and Senate wings. That movement is already on foot. I oppose that, and I am sure the gentleman does.

Mr. LANHAM. I am quite familiar with that situation, but no architectural changes are contemplated in the repair of these roofs?

Mr. STEFAN. None whatever, and I am sure that my chairman will agree to that. There is no contemplated change in the architectural appearance. The roof merely is to be replaced.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. By opening up this subject of repairs to a part of the building, will it not then be open for the improvement that has been suggested here, changing the entire face of the Capitol?

Mr. RABAUT. There have been repairs to the roof of the Capitol in several places. Of course, an emergency knows no set rule, and this is an emergency measure.

We are advised by the engineers not to delay this matter beyond the next recess of Congress.

Mr. DOWELL. About what will the repairs that are necessary now cost?

Mr. RABAUT. The estimate—and it is only an estimate—is \$585,000. That is a new roof for the House wing and a new roof for the Senate wing. Incidentally, the claim is that the Senate wing is in worse condition than the House wing.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If everything that is old is bad, and therefore incapable of serving its present day needs, why not tear down the whole Capitol and build it anew, along the lines of present-day ideas? This Capitol has stood here for some eighty-odd years and seems to have served fairly well.

Mr. RABAUT. The committee is simply charged with the duty to present such matters as come before the committee to the House. That is the position of your chairman.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I am wondering, after hearing the gentleman's statement about the alarm over the roof situation, whether he thinks, considering the attitude of the press generally, there would be much alarm on the part of the American people if they thought there was danger of these two roofs collapsing while the Congress was in session?

Mr. RABAUT. It has been suggested that perhaps the hanging of the loudspeaker upon the roof was more than the old structure would stand. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Have there been any studies or reports in regard to this cast-iron dome over the central portion of the Capitol?

Mr. RABAUT. It has been examined and found to be in very good shape. The dome, on account of its shape, is a different type of structure.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. It is cast iron.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. All the braces in the roof over the Chamber are cast iron, and that is what makes it difficult to rebuild.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I am not learned in the sciences, but I have understood that the fatigue of metals was particularly noticeable in cast iron, and that particular feature has only been studied at length within the last few years.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that the full Committee on Appropriations took the amount for reconstruction of the roofs from the bill this morning with the idea that we should have some additional study and bring it up before the close of this session, after further investigation has been made by engineers. Then it could be brought up again in a deficiency bill if it is determined the work should be undertaken.



Now, under "Architect of the Capitol" we have some other suggested improvements which the committee did not see fit to approve. For paving of roadways around the Capitol, \$390,000 was proposed. This amount was not thought necessary. It was thought improper to make the improvement now because of the fact that if the roof is to be repaired or replaced, there will be a great deal of heavy traffic and we would have our new roadway all cut up. So we think we should just leave this matter stand as it is for the present. I feel it should wait until the entire Capitol is changed, if they are going to change it. If they are going to drop the subject of changing the Capitol, then the roadway could be adjusted according to the plan of those having that matter in charge.

There was a request by the Architect's office to replace a roof on the terrace out here, in the amount of \$345,350. The committee visited the structure, went through the passes below the terrace, and suggested that if the rooms were to be used for some purpose affecting the Congress itself and the activities of the Congress, and not for shops and places of storage, and so on, the committee might be interested in repairing it and making necessary alterations to adapt it to such use. So this matter is left out of the bill. We will have a new plan available for consideration next year.

The Library of Congress: As the committee knows, the Library has moved into the new annex building. The committee was confronted with a request for 181 new employees for general expansion. A similar situation to that existed 40 years ago when the Library was moved from the Capitol into the Library proper, across the park.

Immediately upon moving into the new building the personnel was doubled to properly staff the building. Within 2 years the new Librarian took charge and the personnel of the Library was redoubled in another 2 years. The committee feels that inasmuch as the proposed appointment of a new Librarian is awaiting the action of the President, and the present Librarian, Dr. Putnam, is to become Librarian Emeritus of the Library, the new Librarian should be free to continue the development of the Library according to his own ideas with the advice and counsel of the Librarian Emeritus, whose 40 years bear silent testimony to the great strides made in this glorious institution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Now, paralleling the situation in 1397, we have a new building over there. Congress last year allowed \$100,000 for staffing the new building—for personnel. This covers the new reading room and all the new departments not heretofore necessary. If the members of the committee have not visited the annex to the Library, you have missed a treat. Go over and look at the annex of the Library and you will see there the last word in the transportation of books; the last word in lighting and in study rooms. It is just an ideal spot for the historian of today and tomorrow. So make a visit to the new Library.

We have allowed an increase of \$15,000, making a total sum of \$85,000 for books for the law library. For the first time a limitation has been placed upon travel for the Librarian and his staff. This has been set at \$5,000. The existing activities of the Library have been continued in the bill, and provision has been made for two new divisions now being set up through gifts from the outside, which activities, of course, require some personnel. There is the new Hispanic room and the new photo-duplication section. Both of these rooms have been equipped very elaborately from gifts that have been made for these purposes to the Library.

We come now to an item that will prove somewhat of a surprise to the membership, but it is an item that has, for the last 2 years, been laid in the lap of this committee. This is an item under the heading Government Printing Office. There has been distributed in the House this morning samples of the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On the cover of this format you will find an analysis showing an estimated saving of \$123,750 per annum. Expressed in percentages it amounts to 16 percent. This is estimated on the size of the

RECORD last year. Should the session be longer this year, as we expect it will be, we figure the saving will be proportionately greater. For this reason we have deducted from the amount of the appropriation for the Government Printing Office the sum of \$135,000.

All of the pages in this format are laid out in pairs. You will note that the first two pages are a print of the front page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the two styles. On the left-hand page you have the RECORD set up in two columns, as is the style today. On the right-hand side you have the proposed format of the RECORD in three columns, and at the bottom of the third column you see the saving of space. So, too, if you turn to the other pages, which are taken at random from different RECORDS just to give an idea of the general saving that would be effected by this proposed change to a three-column page, you will note the saving of space.

While we mention the proposed saving of \$135,000 which has been laid in the committee's lap for 2 years straight by an outright offer from the Government Printer to reduce his appropriation \$135,000 if we wish to make this change in the RECORD, we have also looked into what effect the change in printing the RECORD would have upon the eyesight and, indirectly, the health of the Members and those who read the RECORD. I have here some letters which were secured by the attending physician, Dr. Calver. I asked him what the effect of a change in the RECORD would be. The present RECORD, with its long lines, causes a double muscular action of the eye. It also causes a greater searching action of the eye when reading to locate the next line.

With the short line of the three-column page proposed there is a single muscular action of the eye, and the searching effort is greatly reduced. It is declared by physicians to be a very readable arrangement and less taxing upon the nerves of the eye.

Dr. Calver writes me:

I am enclosing four letters written by the Surgeon of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, the commanding officer of the United States Naval Hospital, and Dr. William Thornwall Davis, one of the outstanding ophthalmologists in the city of Washington, giving their comments on the proposed change in the form of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is interesting to note that these gentlemen are all in favor of the proposed change on the basis of the reduction of strain and eye fatigue.

The designing of the style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not a matter coming within the jurisdiction of this committee, but the saving of money is distinctly within the province of the Committee on Appropriations. The format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is strictly a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Printing. I have talked to members of the Joint Committee on Printing and the question was raised by one member as to what effect this change in form would have on the employees of the Government Printing Office. We took up that phase of the question with the Public Printer and I interrogated him at length concerning it.

He assured me that no one would be dismissed and no one would suffer a reduction in pay. You know, we are inclined to regard the RECORD as the principal job of the Government Printing Office, but, actually, the RECORD is only an incident in the greatly varied activities of the Government Printing Office. The Government Printing Office operates 12 months a year. The RECORD is printed only during the time the Congress is in session. While in the last few years we have learned what it is to be here for considerable lengths of time, we must remember that some years ago the duration of sessions was much shorter. Thus the RECORD is incidental to the entire activities of the Printing Office.

The suggestion is still made, however, by the Government Printer that we can save \$135,000. The proposed change is further supported by the statement of physicians and oculists that it is more readable and that it causes less eyestrain. The committee feels, with all due respect to the other committees involved, that it should take cognizance of the suggested savings, and the committee is unanimous in suggesting to the House that this change be made.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if the joint committee feels this should not be done, after due study, that committee has until the last deficiency bill to make its decision, at which time the Public Printer may come in and ask for a deficiency appropriation in the amount of \$135,000, which the committee has taken from his appropriation. Incidentally, may I say when I presented this matter today to the full Committee on Appropriations there was not one dissenting vote. So I am happy to bring it before the House, and I hope you will act favorably upon it.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. On page 10 of the report there is a statement to this effect:

Under the law the Joint Committee on Printing is vested with authority to fix the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and members of the Joint Committee are now considering the advisability of making the proposed change.

May I call to the gentleman's attention and to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that there has been no meeting of the Joint Committee on Printing? As a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, I have no knowledge whatever of this matter having been given consideration or having been looked into, or of any action whatsoever.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, may I say that last December, when Mr. Lambeth was chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, there was sent to all members by correspondence a letter in reference to this change. Each individual member had notice. However, no committee meetings have been held, and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] is a new member of the committee, I may say it is possible this matter will be taken up if and when we have a meeting of the joint committee.

Mr. CONNERY. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations is now placing the Joint Committee on Printing on the spot, if this provision in the bill goes through, forcing them to take some action toward adopting this new format for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am not convinced that a saving of \$135,000 can be made unless at least \$100,000 of that \$135,000 is taken out of labor down there in the Government Printing Office. I cannot see how it can be done without eventually doing away with jobs.

Mr. RICH. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations stated a minute ago, the Joint Committee on Printing was not forced into this. I made inquiry this morning. It was only the matter of making a deduction of \$135,000 in this bill. The Joint Committee on Printing will have an opportunity to convene between now and the 1st of June and if and when the members of that committee decide they want to put it into effect, O. K. If they decide it should not go into effect, then they may ask for a subsequent appropriation of \$135,000 and the Government Printing Office will not be inconvenienced in any manner.

Mr. CONNERY. Probably I should look at this as a magnanimous gesture on the part of the Committee on Appropriations, this endeavor of the Appropriations Committee to force the Printing Committee to take favorable action by initiating this action through a reduced appropriation; but my idea is that the Joint Committee on Printing should have had priority in considering this proposal, and should have had priority in presenting it to the House for appropriate action.

Mr. RICH. The Joint Committee on Printing has had every opportunity to consider it because we have been in session for practically a month and a half. We have not had a meeting of the Joint Committee on Printing. That is no fault of the chairman of that committee, because he has been willing to have a committee meeting at any time and he is willing to give his time and attention to the matter; however, we are having a difficult time in getting the Senate to join with the House in this matter.

Mr. CONNERY. When the Committee on Printing does take the matter up we have no assurance it will look with favor on this change. I have been informed this matter was placed before both the Republican and Democratic leaders during the late days of the last session of the Congress and every one of them was against the proposition.

Mr. RICH. That is not the fact.

Mr. CONNERY. I have been so informed.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. I note the analysis of savings set forth on this sample is \$123,750, whereas the gentleman indicated the saving would be approximately \$135,000.

Mr. RABAUT. I think I stated that this is based on the size of the RECORD last year, and, as we anticipate a longer session, which will make a larger and more voluminous RECORD, the savings will be greater.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. That explains the matter.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY]. It is true that there is some feeling about this change; however, it is also true that for 2 years straight the Government Printing Office has laid in the lap of this committee this saving of \$135,000, and the committee can no longer be put in the position of looking with indifference upon it. If after the Joint Committee on Printing has made a study of the matter it should rule otherwise, if it should feel this change should not be made, no injustice has been done anyone, because the Government Printer may go to the deficiency committee and have this amount returned to him due to the fact the Joint Committee on Printing did not change the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman to explain a little more where these savings will come from?

Mr. RABAUT. It is explained right on page 1.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Explain it for the RECORD. Is it true that 75 percent will come from the workers? Will it be necessary to reduce the personnel over in the Printing Office?

Mr. RABAUT. There is no one in this House who comes from a district in which there are more workers than the gentleman before you from Detroit, Mich.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am not trying to embarrass the gentleman, but I would like information.

Mr. RABAUT. There is no greater friend of the workingman in this House than I am. We have this set-up, and we ought to have some respect for the readability of the RECORD or for the format of the RECORD as far as it affects eyesight. As I say, we should have some respect for that problem. Here we have the testimony of prominent oculists, men high in their profession, and they say this is a great improvement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Further, these are the figures with regard to the savings that will be made:

	Present format (2 column)	Proposed 7½ on 8½- point (3 column)
Composition.....	\$302,873.00	\$249,475.45
Imposition and make-up.....	27,950.00	23,206.89
Platemaking.....	59,626.00	49,600.47
Presswork.....	140,000.00	117,242.00
Binding.....	95,000.00	79,378.50
Paper stock.....	103,742.56	86,736.65
Total.....	729,191.56	605,441.56
Saving.....		\$123,750.00
Percent.....		16.97



I asked the following question during the hearings:

Mr. RABAUT. Will this change to this improved format for the RECORD cause any reduction in personnel in the Government Printing Office?

Mr. GIEGACK. We do not contemplate any reduction in personnel because of this change in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then there must be less work for those already employed?

Mr. RABAUT. There is less work, less paper is used, it is a smaller-sized RECORD, and when the RECORD is bound it will be a smaller-sized volume.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then this will represent a pay cut for the people who are now employed in the Printing Office?

Mr. RABAUT. There will not be a pay cut. There will not be a single person who will receive a cut in pay. As a matter of fact, the Government Printing Office never has been current with its work. This would give them somewhat of a breathing spell. They will be able to get closer to operating on time. As I said before, the RECORD is only one of the activities of the Government Printing Office and, in fact, is only a seasonal printing job.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I believe the real question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is a member of the Committee on Printing, is that the Committee on Printing has jurisdiction over all printing matters; that we all agree, and the Committee on Appropriations appropriates the money authorized by law. As I understand, there is no new legislation in this bill; therefore, there must be lodged somewhere the authority to fix or change the form of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This would naturally go to the Committee on Printing. The gentleman from Massachusetts is complaining because the Committee on Appropriations is usurping and attempting by indirection to perform the functions of the Committee on Printing. I notice this provision is drawn so artfully that no point of order would lie against it. It is just a question of your allowing so much and then making the committee come in and make a negative case.

I agree with the gentleman as far as economy is concerned, but I believe the Committee on Appropriations should be very careful not to attempt to become a supercommittee which would make the legislation for all the things coming before the Congress.

Mr. RABAUT. There is no attempt on the part of the Appropriations Committee to legislate anything. We do not want to legislate at all. However, no one is charged with the responsibility of checking the possibility of this saving except this committee, which has had the proposition offered to them for 2 consecutive years. The committee felt, and I think rightfully so, that they should attempt to make this saving.

Then if it is shown that the saving cannot be made without adversely affecting the membership of the House and Senate and other users of the RECORD, which would be determined by the findings of the Joint Committee on Printing, the Public Printer could be told, "You were wrong in your suggestion to the Appropriations Committee and you can go back and ask for a deficiency appropriation."

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman has stated at least twice that this matter has been in the lap of his committee for 2 years. Does the gentleman mean to tell the House this format has been before the committee for 2 years?

Mr. RABAUT. I did not say anything about the format. I said that the proposed saving of \$135,000 has been before the committee. The only reason the format is here is to show what the suggested change is. We are not proposing the new format. We are just telling you what the Government Printing Office says can be done.

Mr. JARMAN. Will the gentleman tell the Committee when this particular format was prepared?

Mr. RABAUT. There was a format previous to this one having between the lines what is called a space of a half point.

It was the same as this format, except that a change was proposed in this format at my suggestion, in order to meet an objection that was presented to me to the effect that some Members of the Senate thought the lines were spaced too narrowly with half a point between the lines of printing. Therefore, I suggested that a new format be made up with the idea of seeing whether or not they would approve of it. Then I thought the House members of the Joint Committee would give even greater approval of it than they apparently gave it the first time I talked to them about it. It seems that since that time something happened which caused them to feel that the chairman was attempting to take from that committee some prerogative in exercising his evident duty to take cognizance of this possible saving of \$135,000, which is backed up by the testimony of the oculists, who claim the improved format is more readable than the present one.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman say the original format was discarded because of some objection in the Senate? Of course, the gentleman does not mean to say that the objection was only in the Senate.

Mr. RABAUT. No. The only objection I had from a Member of the House, if the gentleman wishes me to bring out this fact, was from my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], who raised question about the labor involved.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman has made the statement that he has been assured by the Public Printer, and, for that matter, I have also been so assured by the Public Printer, that this change will in no way affect anybody's job; but just take the first line in this table on the first page of this analysis of the savings on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which states, "Composition, present format, \$302,873," as against \$249,475 under the proposed format.

If the gentleman or anybody else could show me how they are going to make that saving without affecting labor by reduction of wages and loss of jobs, I would like to have them do it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I may say I do not believe we have had a single Department of the Government come before the Committee on Appropriations without complaining about the high cost of printing at the Government Printing Office. Practically every Department of the Government claims that it could get its printing done away from the Government Printing Office a whole lot cheaper than in the Government Printing Office. As was stated by the chairman of the subcommittee a few moments ago, the Public Printer assured him that the difference in the cost of composition would be with respect to men whom he could use in doing work in other branches of the Government Printing Office.

If he can use the same people that he has over there for other work that he is trying to do, goodness knows we ought to cut down the expense of the Government Printing Office in any way we can. That is your duty and that is my duty, and I know the chairman of the subcommittee is willing to do anything he can to have a good, sound, economical job done. I am not here speaking for this matter, because when the time comes we, as a Joint Committee on Printing, will take this up and study every phase of it, and then do that which, in our judgment, is best, and I am convinced that the chairman of the subcommittee is not trying in any way to do anything that would take away from the Joint Committee on Printing any of its rights or privileges.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. JARMAN. Will the gentleman tell the Committee when and where this present format originated?

Mr. RABAUT. The original format—I do not know where it originated.

Mr. JARMAN. The one you passed on?

Mr. RABAUT. That is only a copy of another format.

Mr. JARMAN. I mean this copy of it.

Mr. RABAUT. The change in the leading of this format was made last week. An additional half-point lead was placed between the lines. As I explained before, the original had a half point between the lines. The present long line, two-column CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has a point and a half between the lines, and this proposed format now of three columns has one point between the lines.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if any member of the Joint Committee on Printing aside from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], and myself have seen this?

Mr. RABAUT. I do not know whether others have seen it or not. I showed it to the three gentlemen mentioned because they constitute the House membership of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. CONNERY. In other words, this format has been printed by the Public Printer at the suggestion of the Committee on Appropriations not because of any approval by the House Committee on Printing or the Joint Committee on Printing?

Mr. RABAUT. So he could prove to us and could prove to the House that we have a right, at least, to say that we believe that the \$135,000 can justifiably be saved. There is plenty of time on this bill, and everybody will be given all the time he wants, but I want to continue and finish my remarks.

I want you to turn to the last page of this sample format of the RECORD. On the last page of this sample format of the RECORD there is a copy of a proposed speech as sent out by the Members of the Congress. Under the present system you have a capacity of 475 words per page, or 950 words on two pages. Under the proposed format in the printing of the RECORD the Members of Congress can send out that same sheet with 820 words on a single sheet, or 1,640 words on a double sheet. The reduction in cost of reprints of speeches resulting from the adoption of the improved format will be approximately 45 percent. I think we ought to acknowledge the situation as it exists.

I want to thank the Committee for the attention they have given me.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado and Mr. DUNN rose.

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I just want to say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON] and myself held a little caucus here with the dual formats before us and we rather thought the present format was easier to read.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Could we not save the Members of the House and the Government a great deal of money by adopting the three-column format and establishing a mat service, so that any Member that wanted to put his remarks before the public in his district could get a mat impression of his speech and run it through the newspapers without going to all the expense and trouble of putting a franking charge on the Post Office Department, when they could put the whole thing before the public just by getting an impression of their speech from that mat and having it run through the newspapers on standard newspaper print?

Mr. RABAUT. That is a very interesting suggestion.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. DUNN. I did not hear all of the gentleman's address, but I want to know whether, with this saving of \$135,000 a year, anyone would lose his job?

Mr. RABAUT. No; not according to the testimony presented to the Committee.

Mr. DUNN. I do not want any more employees losing their jobs.

Mr. RABAUT. I agree with the gentleman. I reserve the remainder of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

#### WHAT SHALL OUR FOREIGN POLICY BE?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, in the confused and unsettled state of the world today, the question of our foreign relations is graver, more delicate, and fraught with more potentialities of danger to our peace than at any time since we made the fateful decision to participate in the World War.

The whole issue of our foreign relations and our national defense has become so befogged by propaganda, hysteria, fear, pride, and resentment that I am impelled to an effort to clarify and simplify the issue in the interests of the national welfare.

I desire to address myself to this question of our foreign relations, not in any spirit of criticism of anybody or of any policy, but rather in a spirit of dispassionate analysis of the fundamental essentials underlying the whole question, in order to promote, if possible, clear thinking on the issue.

There is one common danger which threatens this and other nations of the world alike. That is emotionalism. The questions of our foreign policy, of our relations with other governments and countries with whom we are at peace, and of our national defense, ought, for the sake of world peace and the safety of our own Nation, to be considered with great calmness and deliberation, and not in an atmosphere supercharged with passion, resentments, suspicions, partisanship, economic fears, racial hatreds, or other forms of irrational emotionalism.

At the outset I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that the statements and declarations made by the high officials of our Government and by the Members of the Congress are not only given a significance abroad which we in this country do not attach to many of the expressions, but are twisted and distorted in other countries until they come to mean something entirely different than the ideas in our minds when we give utterance to these all too frequently ill-considered sentiments and arguments.

Mr. Chairman, great confusion has arisen from the secrecy surrounding our foreign policy. A certain amount of secrecy in the conduct of our foreign affairs by those charged with that function is, of course, necessary and inescapable. On the other hand, it is highly desirable, if we are to maintain that calm and deliberative state of mind which will enable us to make the wisest decisions, that there should be no more secrecy about the conduct of our foreign relations than is absolutely essential to the national welfare.

We have already witnessed the confusion, the acrimonious debate, the controversy, and the emotionalism aroused by secret conferences. Harsh words have been spoken which ought not to have been spoken. Controversies have arisen which ought not to have arisen. Suspensions have been engendered which ought not to have been engendered. Divergencies of views have come about which ought to have been avoided. If there is any subject upon which there should be the closest, freest, frankest, sincerest cooperation between the administrative and legislative departments of the Government to the end of helping to maintain world peace and of keeping this country out of war, it is the subject of our foreign relations and our national defense.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me give you what I conceive to be the fundamentals of the different policies which are urged upon us. I wish to repeat that I am approaching the subject not in a spirit of criticism but in a spirit of a desire to clarify the question, in order that we may think straight in adopting whatever policy we shall eventually embrace with regard to our foreign relations and our national defense.

It serves no good purpose to deny that the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet possess tremendous power, through their public utterances, to shape sentiments and mold public opinion in other countries. That is also true of Members of the Congress. That being true, the welfare of this Nation, perhaps the blood and the lives of our citizens, demand that all of us should carefully weigh



our words when we publicly discuss the relations existing between other nations, such quarrels as may be in the making between other nations, and our own relations to those international relations and quarrels.

Mr. Chairman, we have two opposing policies urged upon our consideration. Let me observe at this point that, up to certain limits, our national defense needs to be expanded and improved. We might as well recognize, however, that beyond those limits the question of an adequate national defense depends entirely upon which of two policies we adopt in our foreign relations. One of these policies—the one favored by the administration—is an internationalistic policy—at least, to a more or less limited degree. The other policy—opposed to the administration's views—is a nationalistic, or isolationist, policy. Let us first consider the internationalistic policy and reduce it to its essentials.

We are told by administration spokesmen that another world war impends. Some declare that it is imminent—the question of a few months. Others declare that it will come within the next 2 years. All of them declare that if a war breaks out in Europe, we cannot avoid being gravely affected by it and, in all probability, sooner or later being drawn into it. "We cannot remain aloof," say administration spokesmen.

It is further contended by the supporters of the administration policy that the so-called democracies of the Old World—meaning principally France and England—are fighting with their backs to the wall against increasing encroachments and growing power on the part of the so-called "aggressor-dictator" nations, meaning principally Germany, Italy, and Japan.

We are also told by administration spokesmen that the South American republics within the zone of influence of the Monroe Doctrine are likewise faced with both economic and ideological penetration by the totalitarian Governments of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Thus far we have heard little about the totalitarian Government of Russia, although communism, too, is making rapid inroads, it is said, in South and Central America, as well as in this country.

The contention of the administration spokesmen is that we must support an economic alliance with those nations opposed to Germany, Italy, and Japan, and facilitate their purchases of machinery and munitions of war in this country, while we invoke economic sanctions against Germany, Italy, and Japan.

It is further contended by the administration that we can pursue such a policy of favoring one group of nations on a cash-and-carry basis, at the same time invoke economic sanctions against other nations, and still remain "short of war."

The administration spokesmen further assert that if we do not thus throw our economic and moral weight on the side of the so-called European democracies, the new philosophies of force may overrun the other continents and invade our own. We are told by the administration that "when we deliberately try to legislate neutrality, our neutrality laws may operate unevenly and unfairly—may actually give aid to an aggressor and deny it to the victim."

Behind all of these assertions apparently lies a conviction on the part of the administration spokesmen that if the so-called aggressor nations can by force overcome and subjugate the European democratic nations, they can then utilize the economic and manpower and the material resources of the subjugated nations to support an attack against us that would be a grave threat to our lives and our Nation.

The administration advocates point out to us that if we act now in an economic alliance with the democratic nations of Europe to discourage, by both our attitude and our economic power, the philosophy of force on the part of the dictator nations, a general war will be averted and time will be afforded to find a way for the peaceful settlement of controversial issues.

The administration spokesmen do not tell us how they propose to effectuate the economic sanctions to be invoked against the dictator nations. They do not tell us what policy we would follow in the event the aggressor nations and the

democracies of the Old World became locked in armed conflict, in which case the democratic nations might not have the money with which to make cash payments to us for machines and munitions of war or for foodstuffs and clothing stuffs for their civilian populations, as well as their armed forces.

The administration spokesmen do not say what would be our policy in event the democratic nations should face defeat in such a war and should call upon us again to throw our manpower into the fray on their side.

Mr. Chairman, having thus briefly outlined the fundamental essentials of the administration's foreign policy, I desire now to examine the isolationist policy.

The advocates of an isolationist policy assert that nobody knows whether or not another world war impends, because nobody knows just how far the rulers of the dictator nations are actually prepared to go toward an armed conflict, by reason of their economic limitations, the danger of internal revolution, and so on.

But, say these advocates of isolation, whether or not war comes in Europe, we can avoid being drawn into it by staying at home and minding our own business and trying to solve our domestic problems as rapidly and as successfully as we can. These isolationist advocates point out that the only way we can meet commercial competition in the South and Central Americas is to manufacture and sell our products in the South and Central American countries at prices which will successfully meet the competition of German, Italian, and Japanese goods. These isolationists further contend that if we attempt to take the attitude that our South and Central American neighbors cannot buy from the dictator nations, but must buy from us at a higher price, such an attitude would be, in fact, imperialistic and would be an abandonment of the administration's good-neighbor policy.

These isolationist advocates further assert that force of arms will not stop the spread of ideologies, because ideas are intangible and cannot be killed with bullets. They say further that a peaceful, prosperous, and friendly United States of America would be the very best example to the peoples of the South and Central Americas of the blessings and advantages of democracy. These isolationists contend that the best conceivable defense against the penetration into this country of either communism, nazi-ism, or fascism is an employed, prosperous people who are maintaining themselves and their self-respect by their own efforts.

These isolationists point out that it is a singular fact that throughout all of this discussion over the past year or more about dictator governments little or nothing has been said about the Stalin Government of Russia, which is perhaps the most dictatorial government on earth today and which rules by terrorism, torture, the bullet, and the noose.

The isolationists contend that when we enter into an economic alliance with the democratic governments of Europe, and begin to invoke economic sanctions against the dictator governments of the world, we have then and there ended our neutrality and already have become participants in an economic world war which inevitably will lead us into a world conflict at arms.

The isolationists insist that if we pursue such a policy of economic alliance with one group of nations while invoking economic sanctions against other nations, we cannot hope to remain "short of war," but will be led directly into war. They further assert that as soon as we take part in such an economic contest and begin to try to starve other nations of either munitions of war or food and clothing stuffs, the decision as to when armed conflict will ensue will rest with those nations against whom we are economically at war, and not with us. It will be for them, and not for us, to decide when they shall resort to arms in order to find relief from economic pressures.

Isolationist spokesmen insist that if Germany and Italy, for instance, were to engage in a decisive war with England and France, they would be so exhausted in both an economic and a military sense that they could not even contemplate crossing the ocean to invade and conquer us for half a century to come.

These isolationists further assert that a policy of economic sanctions could be made only partially effective, because there would be no way for us to prevent other neutral nations from purchasing and reselling our munitions and goods, except by invoking economic sanctions against all the nations of the world which might be doing business and carrying on trade with the dictator nations. This, of course, would also be true of embargoes under the Neutrality Act if war should ensue.

Our isolationist friends—some of them, at least—insist that our attitude and expressions on this question, instead of deterring the dictator nations away from war, may well cause them to hasten into a war in the hope that they can win such a conflict before the United States could get into a position to make itself effective on the side of the democracies.

The isolationists point out that we got into the World War by successive steps, which would be repeated in event of another war. They cite, first, that there was a very delicate question as to which side we would take in the last war—whether that of the Central Powers or of the Allies. They also call attention to the fact that at first our allies wanted only money, or rather credits—which meant munitions and supplies. They did not want us to send men. Before the conflict was over, however, we had more men in France than some of the other nations. Following the war our allies were not even grateful for our expenditures of money and men. We were berated for not having gone into the war sooner. The war debts and the post-war debts were scaled down and reduced, and scaled down and reduced, and even today the remainder of those debts is in default.

The isolationists insist that it is illogical to believe that England and France, for instance, are going to purchase American airplanes unless they have positive assurance that in event they are engaged in war they will be able to get both parts and replacements from us. It is further pointed out that in an armed conflict our economic allies, the democracies, would again find themselves short of money with which to purchase machines and munitions of war and other necessary supplies, and probably short of ships with which to transport such machines and munitions and supplies from America to their own shores.

The result would be, say these isolationists, that we would again be asked by the democratic nations to finance their war, and, finally, if they became hard pressed, we would take the last step—as we did in the World War—and send men across to spill their blood. With such an armed conflict in progress, assert the isolationists, the moral obligations resting upon us to stand by our economic allies would be too strong to be resisted.

These advocates of isolation also claim—and not without a great degree of logic—that if an economic and moral alliance with the Old World democracies is a necessity for our own safety, in event they were too hard pressed by the dictator nations in an armed conflict the same reasons would impel us to send our citizens again to foreign battlefields. The isolation advocates insist on this basis that the inevitable final result would be that not only would we have to finance and help fight another war, and not only would we never be able to collect any of the war loans made to finance another war, but the depression in the United States which would follow such a war, as depressions have always followed wars, would be so great as gravely to threaten, if not destroy, our own constitutional form of government and throw us into a fascistic or a communistic dictatorship.

These isolationists insist that if we are going to take the first step of economic alliance with any group of nations, and if we are going to take the second step of invoking economic sanctions against any other group of nations, we ought to face the facts squarely and let the people of the Nation know that such a course probably will lead to our participation in another world conflict. They assert, further, that the people, who have to do the fighting and the dying and the paying in any war in which we are engaged, ought to have the final decision as to whether or not we shall embark upon such a course.

Finally, these isolationists assert that if we are going to try to bring moral pressures and economic sanctions to bear in

an effort to avert war we would be far more effective if we were to take the open position that we would throw the whole force of our resources—our economic and our manpower—on the side of the democratic nations in event of such a conflict, and that we would do it promptly.

This brings us squarely face to face with the question, Do the American people want to go into another world war in an effort to make the world safe for democracy or to end wars?

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can clearly see that the question of an adequate defense—beyond certain well-defined limits which we are informed by our Army and Navy officers are essential as common-sense insurance against eventualities—hinges upon the question of which policy we are to pursue. If we pursue one policy—that of internationalism and economic alliance—then we will need a military machine capable not only of defending our own shores but of maintaining a line of communication with foreign shores where our armies might be fighting. If we are to follow a stay-at-home-and-mind-our-own-business policy, then we will need a military defense mechanism of a much different character.

Thus, it seems to me we are faced with a necessity for a clear choice of either an internationalistic or an isolationist policy before we can determine with certainty the necessities and requirements of our military machine. The House and Senate Committees on Military Affairs seemed to have heard one sort of report from military officers and another kind of report from at least two of our foreign Ambassadors.

The question arises here as to whether two foreign Ambassadors are more capable of weighing the conditions in Europe and judging how imminent is war, and how vitally and how quickly that war may affect us, than are our military officials, with their special training, their constant study of these questions, and their vast network of intelligence agents throughout the world.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, there have been assertions that these Ambassadors were recalled to Washington by the administration and sent before the congressional committees as high-pressure salesmen rather than as experienced observers and judges of the imminence of war and its probable effects upon this Nation.

However that may be—and I am passing no judgment on that question—we must make a choice as to our advisers. Either they will be our military and naval authorities, who ought to be able to advise us very capably, or they will be civilians who might possibly be actuated by something other than cool, dispassionate, logical analysis based upon accurate information.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I have at least made clear the fundamental essentials of these two conflicting policies, and in doing so that I may have emphasized the necessity for cool, calm, dispassionate deliberation on this question, instead of emotionalism, hysteria, suspicion, rancor, hatreds, or resentments.

I have not considered a middle course, so-called, between these two philosophies of internationalism on the one hand and isolation on the other, because, I confess, I have been unable to see any middle course. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we either must take sides or remain completely aloof. It seems to me that if we do take sides we must do so with a full and clear realization that we may be embarked upon a journey that will lead us directly into another World War; while if we take the other course, we may find ourselves standing practically alone as the last great democracy in a world gone mad with blood lust and a philosophy of force.

However, whatever we in the Congress decide to do should be done with calmness and deliberation and a due sense of the momentous results which must, in any case, grow out of our decision. [Applause.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill that we now bring before you is the second regular annual supply bill reported thus far this session and deals with appropriations for our legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1940. It comes to you as concrete evidence of how much it costs you to run your business up here on Capitol Hill. Your subcommittee has been working on this bill since January 30



and has had unusual opportunity to examine our proposed legislative expenditures with care. Only recently this House passed the independent offices bill, carrying \$1,604,000,000. This bill was cut \$1,580,000. I call your attention to the present bill, which came to our committee with Budget estimates of \$24,287,946 and which we bring to you with a total of \$21,636,398, a saving under the Budget of \$2,651,548.

You may also be interested to know that requests running into many hundreds of thousands of dollars were eliminated by our subcommittee because we felt that we must begin economizing in every department of government. Included in these eliminations were requests for new terraces and repairs, \$345,000; new pavement in front of the Capitol, \$390,000; moving floors from the Office Building to the House, \$200,000; roofs, \$585,000; printing, \$135,000; new greenhouses, \$90,000; new sidewalks, \$25,000; new personnel, \$340,000; printing and binding, \$108,000; and many other items too numerous to mention here.

You may also be interested to know that there came before us only two heads of activities who asked or suggested reductions. One suggested that we could cut the Government Printing Office appropriation \$135,000 and there was another suggested cut of \$2,500.

Every Member of this House should diligently read the hearings on this bill. It contains valuable information for each Member regarding what it costs to run this House and the legislative branch of the Government. While the hearings contain but 330 pages, there was the equivalent of many pages of "off the record" discussions through which your subcommittee endeavored to learn where further reductions could be made.

The entire hearings, in my opinion, developed the fact that the subcommittees, as well as the full Committee on Appropriations and the entire House membership, are groping pretty much in the dark on how much money we should or should not appropriate for the various activities of the Government. We are entirely dependent upon the honesty and competency of the department and bureau heads who appear before us showing justifications for these expenditures. The value of the Appropriations Committee clerks is beyond estimate. These able men in our service are the guardian angels of committee members and, in my opinion, save the Government many times the amount they receive in salary.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Not with reference to this particular appropriation bill but with reference to various other agencies of the Government and departments, I recall that in the last Congress the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Umstead] made the pertinent suggestion that it would be an expenditure that would make for economy, if the Congress would authorize certain experts to serve as agents of the Committee on Appropriations, and would investigate through the year in the various departments those very items and the way these moneys are expended, in order to know what items could be properly eliminated. Does not the gentleman think that would be a wise provision if the Congress should give as assistants to the Committee on Appropriations men of this character, whose job it would be the year round to investigate these items, these expenditures, and give us expert information through the Committee on Appropriations as to economies that could reasonably and properly be effected?

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to my colleague from Texas that he is making exactly the statement that I was about to make, and I thank him for his contribution. I shall continue from there on. The gentleman has hit the nail on the head.

Mr. LANHAM. Are not their labors so onerous that they do not have time themselves to make this investigation that I speak of.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about that. These valuable clerks in the Committee on Appropriations are career men who know more about appropriations than any Member

in the House. I feel that the men occupying the responsible positions as heads of the various departments and bureaus are highly qualified and are possessed of high character. Yet I feel that the administrators in each department and bureau are likely to be so keenly interested in the growth and expansion of their activities that they are not always helpful to committees seeking to reasonably restrain and regulate such expansion.

The membership of these committees, knowing the ever-mounting indebtedness of the Federal Government, must feel that some day a real accounting must be made to the taxpayers. There is a national debt of around \$40,000,000,000 and the deficiency of revenue receipts as compared to expenditures seems not to have been considered by some of the witnesses that appear before the committees.

This is glaringly manifest in one statement made to our subcommittee by a high official. He said: "Reductions do not often happen in Government establishments." I do not quote him by way of criticism but just to show Members how those in Government service feel about it and that they really know that "reductions do not often happen."

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I feel that this Congress should give immediate study to the possibility of employing disinterested experts. Men who know costs and who know something about efficiency and coordination of business so that that knowledge may be applied to expenditures in the Government establishments. Perhaps some of the present valuable clerks of the Appropriations Committee could be so utilized. But, certainly, if we are to continue to expend the people's money upon the recommendations of employees to whom the funds are entrusted, there is bound to be some over-emphasis leading to appropriations that might otherwise be reduced or eliminated. Disinterested efficiency experts, trained in the matter of saving money for the Government; men who are responsible directly to the Congress, would actually save many millions of dollars every year and the membership would actually know that appropriations are being made according to scientific rather than guesswork standards.

I know that there is an opportunity for more saving in this branch of the Government. I know that there are many activities of doubtful utility that should be eliminated, and I hope that subsequent subcommittees handling future bills of this kind will profit somewhat by whatever savings we have made in this particular bill. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the committee by saving nearly \$2,000,000 has set the precedent which we should follow in future appropriations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the committee has done a very fine piece of work. This reduction is one of the best showings that any subcommittee has brought before the House.

Mr. STEFAN. There should be more. We know that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to get the gentleman's opinion with regard to the roof matter, whether the gentleman thinks there is any immediate necessity for any further investigation, or what should be done as a matter of protection.

Mr. STEFAN. The matter of \$585,000 for the replacement of the roof over this Chamber and the roof over the Senate Chamber came before us suddenly. We knew nothing about it until it came before us all of a sudden. It came as the result of an investigation on the part of a very high type consulting engineer. In answer to my question as to whether or not there was immediate danger he told me that in case we have a 30-inch snow he would recommend that the Members of the House move out. He told us there is 50 percent danger in these roofs. This committee did not want to be on record as failing to safeguard life. They brought before us the question of the Knickerbocker Theater, when the roof caved in some 20 years ago as the result of a heavy snow, and many lives were lost. We did not want to be on record as being niggardly in money when it came

to saving human life. However, they told us they would not do any work until the House was vacant; until the Congress had adjourned.

My concern and the concern of the membership of the committee was with your lives and the lives of these precious people who are sitting in the galleries, who visit here every day. If there is any danger whatsoever, the danger must exist now. At our meeting this morning we eliminated the \$585,000, because we felt we had not received enough expert information. So we have in the bill an item of \$5,000 for immediate investigation, further investigation, with the hope that if there is any immediate danger, your lives and the lives of the public will be safeguarded.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not the gentleman think that the acoustics of this Chamber should be improved? This is the greatest deliberative body in the world, and this Chamber has the poorest acoustic properties.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think so. As the result of the installation of these loud speakers, the acoustics are all right, if you will use them properly. But nothing should be done in this entire building which would in any way eliminate any valuable American architecture. There is a movement on foot, and has been for many years, to do a lot of tearing down and changing. I have been fighting, as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, together with my distinguished chairman and other Members of this House, for years and years, to stop modern vandals, who would destroy valuable American architecture. A movement is on foot today to move the front of the Capitol out to meet the House wing; to put up a marble dome, and God knows what; destroy many of the scroll works and valuable things that we should preserve for future generations.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman does not think that the men who designed the ceiling of the Mormon Temple in Salt Lake City were vandals, does he? The gentleman does not think that the men who designed the ceiling of the great Radio City in New York are vandals, does he?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, we do not refer or are we discussing the Mormon Temple or Radio City in New York. The question was asked whether or not the acoustics could be improved. I think there has been a great improvement since we installed this voice-aid system.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman recognizes, however, that in general debate, if a Member does not have access to one of these loud speakers, his voice does not rise any higher than it ever did.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, that is a debatable question. You can add all the microphones you want.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, during the last several days Republican oratory has flown freely as Republican leaders throughout the Nation gathered to observe the birthday of the father of their party, Abraham Lincoln.

I have listened intensely and with a degree of amusement to their ridiculous claims for achievement during recent years and to their equally ridiculous tirades against the present Democratic administration and its accomplishments which have, however, in virtually every instance been supported by the vote of an overwhelming majority of the Republican membership of Congress. Now, Mr. Chairman, as a Member of this Congress, as a member of the Democratic Party, and as one who loves his country, I do not intend that this challenge go unanswered.

After having listened to their self-praise, their claims of present-day accomplishment, and being myself familiar with Republican leaderships and their results during the last quarter of a century, I recalled the political philosophy of the founder of that party, the great humanitarian, the fearless courageous leader, Abraham Lincoln, and I then secured a

copy of the Republican platform of 1860, upon which Lincoln was elected President, and again read its provisions. I could not help but be amused at the tremendous contrast between the principles of Republicanism, as announced and practiced by Lincoln, and Republicanism, as practiced by Republican leadership during my lifetime. Regardless of our views toward prevailing conditions and the sectional issues of 1860, there could be no doubt but that Abraham Lincoln, like the founder of our great Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, firmly believed in observing and promoting the rights, the opportunities, the liberty and freedom of the average citizen of America. It was upon his love for and devotion to the meek, the humble, and the lowly citizen that he based the greatness of his party and the determination of his efforts. It was his love for humanity that gave a soul to the Republican Party. The Republican Party in recent years, however, has practiced doctrines as far from these as the East is from the West.

The Republican Party, under whose rule I have lived the major portion of my life, has practiced a governmental policy of special privilege, unjust economic discriminations, and selfish protection for favored interests that has sapped the economic vitality of this Nation, pauperized the producers of our raw products, concentrated the wealth and the purchasing power of our people in the hands of a few dominating families, and brought our Nation to the brink of destruction. Their satellites, like the Scribes and Pharisees of old, pronounce beautiful prayers of praise on the street corners and in the public places, but practice the iniquities of special privilege in their secret councils.

When I read of Lincoln and then of the leaders of Lincoln's party today, I am reminded of the description of the mighty Caesar as given by Cassius to Brutus, when he said:

'Tis a common proof that lowliness is young ambition's ladder,  
Whereto the climber upward turns his face;  
But when he once attains the upmost round  
He then unto the ladder turns his back,  
Looks in the clouds,  
Scorning the base degrees  
By which he did ascend.

The principles of the lowly Lincoln have today become the scorn of the party of Lincoln. Could Abraham Lincoln return today and observe the travesties perpetrated by Republican leaders in his name, he would scourge them from the party even as Christ drove the money changers from the temple. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in 1932 the American people, disgusted with hypocritical Republican leadership, turned in their hour of desperate need, as they had done so often before in the history of our Nation, to the principles and to the leaders of democracy. They accepted and proclaimed the political doctrine as announced by the Democratic Party in the campaign of 1932, and they still believe in those doctrines. True it might be that our Democratic leaders in their anxiety to ameliorate the desperate plight of the great mass of our citizenship listened too intently to the false doctrines of economic and political theorists who follow the false gods of planned economy, socialism, and communism. The average citizen, however, has no desire to turn back to the equally false doctrine of the Republican leadership, special privilege, by which the average citizen has been driven to poverty and servitude. They will not return to it. [Applause.]

Much good has been accomplished by Democratic leadership during the last 6 years. Many evils have been corrected, many injustices removed. It is only natural that at the same time some evil should have crept in and some false doctrines at times confused those who occupied high place. The Democratic Party today, however, holds firmly the torch of human liberty within its fearless grasp; and here in the Congress, in this House of Representatives, abides that Democratic leadership which loves our freedom and our liberty, a leadership that is courageously and successfully promoting, protecting, and defending the weak, the needy, and the destitute in spite of the scorn and ridicule of a party leadership which, having lived sumptuously upon the economic lifeblood



of a great people for over half a century, has grown immune to the pleading cries of the average citizen in his hour of need.

Much yet remains to be done. We must learn again the principles of the true American system of government, principles forgotten during years of Republican exploitation. The great people of our country forgetting for a time that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance were bought with their own gold into almost complete servitude. But America has now awakened. We will learn again the true principles of free government and apply them to our problems yet unsolved. Under Democratic leadership we are learning them again and we are applying them. Under the banner of democracy we shall continue to carry the torch of freedom. The scorn of a diseased Republican Party will serve only to point out our errors and give courage to our efforts. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, what, except the sneers of a cynic, is the Republican Party offering as a solution to our unsolved problems? How would they solve the problems of the manufacturers, the laborers, the miner and the farmer except by a return to their iniquitous practices of greed and avarice? What leadership do they offer to the average citizen of this country in his desperate effort to earn a living for himself, his wife, and his children except the leadership of despair, of economic servitude divested of both liberty and private initiative? Such leadership, Mr. Chairman, travels the highway toward feudalism, toward monarchy, toward the divine right of kings. Mr. Chairman, Americans over a century and a half ago marched with George Washington in command against the forces of tyrannical power, and in the blood of their comrades struck down by the rule of brutal force, out of this highway of human servitude across the wilderness of trials and experimentation, into the long-sought roadway of free government.

They perfected a new and untried political organization known as Americanism and used it to secure for themselves and their posterity their inalienable rights.

Abraham Lincoln loved that political system and gave his life in the strengthening of it; but today the Republican Party, made great through the inspired determination of a great leader, has lost its soul; its useful day has past. There still remains, however, a living, breathing, growing democracy in whose ranks march millions of descendants of the followers of Washington, good American citizens who love their freedom, their liberty, and their free institutions. Their devotion to the cause of Americanism will save our institutions and preserve the rights and the liberties of our people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I have not a prepared address to answer my distinguished colleague from Georgia. He must have put much time and effort into the preparation of that manuscript. Imagination had to run wild in the efforts he made to try to find some excuse for the unfortunate conditions that prevail in the Democratic Party today.

I extend to you Members on the Democratic side today my sympathy. It is a sad condition of affairs when the majority party finds itself with dissension prevailing such as prevails among you men today. It is not surprising that dissensions drive deeper wedges day by day into your ranks. It could not be otherwise with the New Deal's disturbing presence in your midst. With its vacillations and inconsistencies to contend with, how could harmony prevail? I do sympathize with your unfortunate lot. It is a pathetic condition.

I have read in the newspapers of the futile efforts you have made to try to bring about a degree of harmony, to try to find some place where you men could find common ground. I am sorry for every one of you men who have resented the purge. Of all men, I am surprised at the distinguished gentleman from Georgia coming here today and trying to belabor with his words the Republican Party, for it was in Georgia that the purge persisted; it was in Georgia that this one-man party

system, against which most of you men are rebelling, had its worst effect. [Applause.] It was in Georgia that you men felt the lash of the Simon Legrees in the past primary campaign, as one of your distinguished sons, one of the valiant men of the Democratic Party, one of those fearless and courageous leaders dared defy the White House and appear as a candidate for another body.

Then it was that the invective; then it was that the patronage whip; then it was that the buying power of your party's leadership tried to purge your party of a brilliant son of Georgia.

I am sorry for your discord. I am sorry for the dissension. It is only because of the dissension in your own ranks that the gentleman from Georgia resorted to the tactics he used today. You are divided. We are united. Complete harmony prevails among Republicans. [Applause.]

We have a united front today. It is not necessary for the minority leader to stand up to try to bring together a warring group of factions. It is not necessary for the minority leader on this side to send out pleas that the membership be present. It is not necessary in any way for the minority leader to take the position that the men are afraid to come to the floor of the House and take a stand. It can only be fear that depletes your ranks here on the floor.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I decline to yield.

Mr. PATRICK. I do not blame the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. May I say to my distinguished friend that if his side of the House will give me additional time I will be happy to yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK].

Mr. PATRICK. I would like to ask the gentleman what they have to fight for over there, how you are going to have any lack of harmony in the Republican Party, when you lambast the Democrats for being too liberal and reach right out and embrace the Townsend plan in one sweep?

Mr. DITTER. May I answer the gentleman by saying that I know of no declaration of the party leadership which has embraced the Townsend system; however, I do know the leadership on the minority side has embraced every liberalism for which Lincoln contended as against the collectivism and regimentation of the present New Deal party in power. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not passing strange that the new dealers find it necessary to put to the front as their defender a man who has perhaps as bad a New Deal record, as far as voting goes, as any man on that side?

Mr. DITTER. That is the unfortunate and embarrassing position that my distinguished colleague who preceded me finds himself in. On vote after vote he repudiated this New Deal policy. Time after time he took exception to what today is the Democratic policy. I want you men on this side to bear in mind one thing. The Democratic Party is responsible for the New Deal, and nobody on this side can avoid responsibility for the failures and the futility of the efforts that have been made by the New Deal to correct the conditions from which the country is suffering. May I repeat the Democratic Party is responsible for the New Deal. Its trust may have been betrayed. It may have been deceived and hoodwinked. But try as it will, the Democratic Party cannot escape the responsibility for the New Deal debacle.

May I remind the group on this side that we still have, some 11,000,000 unemployed. We still have the great problem of our social difficulties and our economic distresses unsolved. We have had 6 years of this New Deal. After 6 years of lending and spending, of ranting and chanting, of dealing and squealing, the problems which you promised to solve remain unsolved.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party is not in any way ashamed of the solidarity that prevails in its ranks today. It flaunts this solidarity in the face of a discordant, disrupted, disorganized group on this side. It flaunts this solidarity and harmony in the face of every one of you who came to your party caucus a few days ago and repudiated the efforts of the White House to make your party a one-man party. The Republican Party stands where Lincoln stood; for a liberalism as broad as the need of humanity, for a common sense that knows that every dollar that is spent has to be earned, that every dollar wasted is somebody's toil thrown away.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I decline to yield.

Mr. GEYER of California. This must be a filibuster.

Mr. DITTER. I cannot accept that as a challenge, sir, when I only have 10 minutes. Give me an hour and I will reply.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was given 5 minutes by this side. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. May I say to the gentleman, I will yield to my friend from Massachusetts providing he will not at this point give voice to the same expression of opinion with reference to the constitutional responsibilities of a Member of Congress, such as he expressed last week—

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman yielding on condition?

Mr. DITTER. During the consideration of the tax bill. Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman yielding on condition? I never thought the gentleman would do a thing like that.

Mr. DITTER. I never thought my distinguished friend would take the stand he did a few days ago. If the gentleman now repudiates the statement he made last week, with reference to constitutional responsibility on the part of a Member of Congress, or if he wishes to amplify in any way that statement I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation—

Mr. DITTER. I have not yielded to the gentleman except for a purpose and with a condition. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHANNON].

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it would be fitting at this time to spread upon the records of this legislative branch of our Government some words of tribute in recognition of the things that the late Pontiff, Pope Pius XI, stood for and exemplified in a long life of spiritual guidance and intelligent and forceful leadership of one of the greatest Christian organizations existing in the world today. It is significant that today millions of persons outside of the church of which he was the supreme ruler and doctrinal arbiter have added their testimonies of regret at his passing to the many millions the world over who acknowledge his apostolic succession and his spiritual leadership. Significant, too, is the grave concern that is being universally expressed as to the choice of his successor, for in these perilous times of wars and rumors of wars his voice was always symbolical of the message that was bequeathed to us by the Master he acknowledged as the apostle of brotherhood among men and the Prince of Peace and Good Will.

It matters not what may be our differences in matters of creeds, in forms of worship, in methods of religious organization. Fundamentally all followers of the gentle Nazarene who came to bring a new gospel to the world 2,000 years ago are in accord if they accept that gospel. The great religious organization of which Pius XI was the head—and the two hundred and sixty-first, I am reminded, in that succession—is one of the oldest in point of continuity as a religious government now in existence. Its history goes back to the dim dawns of modern civilization.

#### DOWN THE CENTURIES

I recall in this connection the eloquent words of a great Protestant historian, Thomas Babington Macaulay. In one of his essays reviewing a book dealing with the life of the papacy,

he said, referring to the long continuance of the Roman Church and its spiritual influence down the ages:

She saw the commencement of all governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in this world. She was great and respected before the Saxon set foot in Britain, before the Franks passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence was still in flower at Antioch, when idols were still worshiped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand upon a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.

I make this quotation not in any spirit of religious controversy but simply as a reminder on this occasion of the far-flung backgrounds of history that lie behind the man who has just ended his succession and passed on, leaving that great organization, with its millions of devoted adherents, awaiting in anxiety for the next spiritual leader in line who, it is hoped, will have the courage, the energy, the faith, the freedom of soul, and the great humanitarian inspiration that Pius XI displayed throughout his long life and his noble pontifical reign. His last days were spent in a changing world menaced by ominous signs of spiritual disintegration. The ancient tenets of his church and of the Master whose work he sought to carry on so faithfully, he realized, are being flouted in many lands. Racial and religious hatreds are being fomented and the old and cruel doctrines of force and conquest and pagan brutalities are seeping into the political atmosphere of many countries and threatening many more. The gentle philosophy of Him who said "Love thy neighbor as thyself" is being supplanted by a philosophy of brute force and the crashing of the moral standards that inevitably go down in the paths of wars and conquest.

#### A COURAGEOUS SPIRITUAL LEADER

This great ruler of a spiritual world set his face courageously to oppose these modern trends—to warn us against the changes that he saw coming, to lift up his voice in eloquent encyclical pleas to mankind to stand by the faith of the fathers and the moral doctrines he deemed essential to the continuance of civilization and the spirit of peace among men. His greatest concern was for the maintenance of the moral standards that make for the very existence of that civilization. We are told by the press dispatches that the very last word upon his lips was "peace." Throughout his pontifical life this man pleaded for it, fought for it, stood up for it in season and out of season. He was valiant for the truth and always courageous in speaking his mind in the face of its enemies.

Gentle though he was in spirit and in his dealings with those around him, this Pope was a strong man in every way. In his youth a climber of mountains and a follower of an outdoor life, he became inured to physical hardships. But he was not only physically strong; he had strength of will, of heart, of purpose. Even in the hours of his illness he rose to his feet to conduct the daily duties of the Vatican that required his attention. A great scholar, an informed librarian, a scientist, a statesman; these great qualities of his mere manhood were surmounted and directed by his supereminent recognition of the spiritual place that he held as the supreme leader of a great religious organization whose reason for being, he deemed, was the regeneration of mankind and the inculcation of the higher virtues of faith, hope, and charity, upon which his church was founded. He brought these considerations to the solution of every problem that came to his hands, and let me say he dealt with these problems in a wholly modern manner. He dodged no issues. He never compromised. Matrimony to him was an indissoluble sacrament, uniting one man and one woman until death did them part. Education to him meant the education that built up the moralities. He spoke his mind about the influences that were at work in the theater, in literature, in the press, in social frivolities and freedoms to undermine these fundamental moralities. He was undaunted by dictators or political despots. The sophistries of politicians did not bewilder him. With a clear insight he saw the growing evils of an unbalanced industrial system and warned against their tendencies, fairly and impartially. Within that free little Vatican City he viewed the world with a free



mind, a free soul, and a heart that understood the "still sad music of humanity," untarnished by worldly aims or selfish schemes of aggrandizement. It was a spot of earth that he kept free from purely physical concerns, dedicated solely to the higher concerns of spirit and the welfare of the higher natures of men, the welfare of the soul, not merely in a world to come but in the world we now live in.

#### HIS LAST THOUGHT FOR PEACE

These are not mere generalities. Pius XI, by the testimony of men of all creeds today, won the admiration of all by his modern methods of dealing with social problems and his outspoken efforts to bring contending factions together and to settle the disputes of statesmen and nations by timely advice and cooperation. He cautioned the industrial world against low wages to workingmen and spoke to workingmen against inordinate demands. He hated communism, not the communism that is created by the specious sophistries of scheming politicians, but the real communism that denies God and hates religion. I mean that sort of communism that is exemplified in a growing spirit of infidelity, of disbelief in Christianity and all that it stands for, and the sort of communism whose aim and purpose is the re-creation of a pagan world, whatever the name you may apply to it. He denounced the modern so-called nationalism as well. "It is a real evil," he said, "and it is not an exaggeration to call it a malediction in the field of religion." Above all, he hated war. His voice died out with the word of peace upon his lips. Those lips are silent now, but let us hope that those words of his departing spirit may live to arouse the world to a realization of the logic of peace and the horror of war.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

#### TRADE TREATIES

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, before addressing myself to the subject of trade treaties, I want to say that I would have greatly enjoyed participating in the debate that has just been going on. I wish to congratulate our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] on being an able exponent of the policies of Abraham Lincoln, a defender of the Constitution, and a prover of the merits of the Republican attitude on great public questions. It was a gem of a speech, and I believe the gentleman well deserves all the praise he received from both sides of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that our friends on the majority side of the House have the advantage over those of us on the minority side in that they are able to make use of all the governmental departments and agencies in gathering material for their remarks. Despite this fact, they have failed to make out a case for the trade-treaty program. Nor have they answered or in any way refuted the basic criticisms of the program which its opponents have presented.

Proponents of the program originally contended that it was the only method by which our foreign trade could be restored. It was said that we must reduce our tariffs in order to secure export markets; that congressional methods of tariff revision were too cumbersome, and hence Congress must surrender its tariff and treaty-making authority to the President, without reserving the right of ratification or rejection of the treaties and without laying down a legislative formula to control the President in making reductions in rates.

#### TRADE RECOVERY BEGAN UNDER TARIFF ACT OF 1930

I most emphatically deny that the trade-treaty program is the only way our foreign trade can be restored. If it be true, as trade-treaty proponents unjustifiably contend, that the Tariff Act of 1930 was in a measure responsible for the 1929 world-wide depression, then it must be equally true that that same act was responsible for the upturn in our foreign trade—both in imports and exports—between 1932 and the time the trade-treaty program went into effect. Those advocating the program, however, are so hard pressed for evidence of the alleged benefits of trade treaties that they even claim the treaties were responsible for the upturn

in trade which resulted long before the treaties ever went into effect. In 1934, only one trade treaty—that with Cuba—was in effect, and it was only operative during the last 4 months. During 1935, only three additional treaties came into effect—that with Belgium on May 1, that with Haiti on June 3, and that with Sweden on August 5. During the entire year 1935, our total exports to these countries increased by approximately 28 millions over the previous year.

Even if all this increase be credited to the treaty program—which I do not concede, since the general trend of exports to all countries was upward—but even if it is all credited to the effect of the treaties, the total is very small in comparison with the total recovery of our export trade from 1932 to 1935. During that period, our total exports increased from \$1,611,000,000 to \$2,283,000,000, or by \$671,000,000. Now, if we subtract the increased export trade which may or may not have resulted from the operation of the four trade treaties in effect in 1935, we have a balance of over \$640,000,000, representing increased export trade from 1932 to 1935, which cannot be credited in any sense to the trade-treaty program. This fact certainly disposes of the contention that the trade-treaty program is the only way by which our export trade can be restored.

#### CONGRESSIONAL TARIFF POWERS SURRENDERED UNDER TREATY PROGRAM

As to the question whether congressional methods of tariff revision are too cumbersome, the record speaks for itself. The proposition is somewhat moot, inasmuch as it has been shown that the Tariff Act of 1930, which the Congress itself wrote, brought about a substantial recovery in our export trade. It was contended that the President must have a free hand in the negotiation of the trade treaties in order to deal effectively with other governments whose heads had similar authority. But while the Congress of the United States has surrendered its authority over tariff and treaty making to the President, legislative bodies in most of the countries with which treaties have been negotiated have reserved the right to approve or reject the treaties. Thus this argument is disposed of. The real reason why the administration wanted a free hand in writing the trade treaties was that it was not certain that Congress would approve the treaties when negotiated, and I am quite sure that that is true insofar as most of them that thus far have been negotiated are concerned. However, that is no justification for surrendering the tariff and treaty-making power to the Executive, in direct contravention of the most fundamental provisions of the Constitution.

#### NO PRECEDENT FOR STAR-CHAMBER METHODS OF NEGOTIATION

Just a word as to the method of negotiating the trade treaties. Whenever any criticism is made of the present star-chamber procedure, by which negotiations are carried on behind closed doors, with representatives of foreign countries sitting around the table with a small group of self-styled tariff experts, trade-treaty proponents always attempt to draw an analogy between such methods and the manner in which previous tariff bills have been written in Congress. They charge that when the Republicans wrote the tariff bill of 1930 the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee were not permitted to assist in drafting the bill. That, of course, is nothing new, since the Democrats did the same thing when they were in power. However, the important point is that when a tariff bill is finally drafted, whether by Republicans or Democrats, it is brought before both Houses for discussion.

But when the trade treaties emerge from the secret council chambers there is no opportunity for review or criticism. Only after they have been signed by the President and thus been made binding on this country are their terms ever made public. Then it is too late to do anything about them. No hearings are ever held on a completed treaty. No opportunity is given Congress to approve or reject them. The people have no voice, through their elected Representatives and Senators in the proceedings at any juncture. In my opinion, democracy and representative government cease to exist under such a system. It is very much analogous to

the system of government by decree which exists in certain foreign countries.

#### OUR TARIFFS NOW WRITTEN BY FOREIGNERS

I want to say that I would much rather trust my Democratic colleagues to write a tariff schedule in the interest of our people—even though Republican Members were excluded—than I would to turn this function of the Congress over to emissaries of foreign governments, whose only interest is to secure a greater share of our rich domestic market at the expense of American agriculture, industry, and labor. Under present procedure, these foreign representatives have more to say about the tariff rates of this country than we Members of Congress who are sent here as the representatives of the people, and to whom is vested under the Constitution the exclusive power to regulate tariff rates. How much longer are you Democrats going to permit this outrageous situation to exist? Certainly the people are not going to permit it to exist beyond 1941.

#### ACT OF 1930 WRITTEN ON SCIENTIFIC BASIS

In this connection, I want to refer briefly to one of the stock Democratic jibes at the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, which falls in the category of demagoguery. I refer to the wholly unfounded charge that a certain interested private citizen had a hand in its preparation. Of course even our Democratic friends know that there is no truth in the charge. I can testify of my own knowledge how the Tariff Act of 1930 was written because I participated in the drafting. Outside of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, the only persons present were Government officials, mostly employees of the Tariff Commission who had special knowledge of the items being considered from time to time. No outside persons were ever present. Rates were fixed, not on the basis of what some person or group desired, but on the basis of what was necessary to equalize foreign and domestic production costs, as indicated by studies made by the nonpartisan experts of the Tariff Commission. This cost-of-production formula was incorporated in the flexible tariff provisions, enabling the President to adjust duties up or down in accordance therewith as conditions of competition changed subsequent to the passage of the act. This formula has been completely eliminated and ignored under the trade-treaty program.

Whatever may be the demerits of Republican tariff measures, they have at least had the virtue of being written in the interest of the American people, which is more than can be said of the trade-treaty program.

#### TREATIES NOT CONDUCTIVE TO PEACE

Since the enactment of the Reciprocal Tariff Act in 1934, a new argument has been advanced in support of the treaty program of which nothing was heard when the legislation was first proposed. I refer to the contention that the treaty program is conducive to world peace. The argument was not advanced until after it became apparent that the treaty program was failing to bring about the great boom in our export trade which was promised. The peace argument was brought forth in an effort to distract attention from the failure of the program in other directions. But after 4½ years it is now quite apparent that it is equally a failure insofar as preserving peace is concerned.

#### NO TANGIBLE CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE CAN BE CITED

We are all in favor of peace, and certainly no one any more so than I. But let us seriously ask ourselves, Just what concrete contribution has the treaty program made toward world peace since it has been in operation?

No one can cite a single tangible result in that direction. On the other hand, we find that during the entire time the program has been in operation conditions throughout the world have grown progressively worse. Never was peace more in jeopardy than today.

#### SUPPORT OF TREATY PROGRAM BASED ON MISLEADING PROPAGANDA

The present trade-treaty program no longer has a leg on which to stand, yet I do not deny that it has widespread support, particularly in the press, based very largely upon the one-sided and frequently misleading propaganda with

which the State Department floods the country. When the other side of the picture is presented—and there is evidence that the people and the press are gradually awakening to what is actually going on under the treaty program—there will, I am sure, be a decided change of attitude. I am told that in one congressional district the sole issue on which the successful Republican candidate campaigned was opposition to the treaty program. I have noted also that the chief proponent of the trade-treaty program here in this House during the past 4 years has been returned to private life by his constituents.

Last Sunday was the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who, I may say, was a great protectionist. Lincoln once said:

I have faith in the people. Let them know the truth and the country is safe.

I, too, have faith in the people, and when they find out the truth about the trade-treaty program they are going to take steps to restore the traditional protective-tariff policy of this country and put back in the hands of their elected Representatives and Senators in Congress the power and duty of fixing tariff rates in accordance with that principle.

#### EXAMPLE OF STATE DEPARTMENT PROPAGANDA

A moment ago, I made a passing reference to the "frequently misleading" propaganda of the State Department. This is not a mere unfounded charge on my part. Let me give you a definite example: Not long ago a Mr. Edminster, an official of the State Department's trade-treaty division, made a speech down in North Carolina in which he endeavored to cite some of the alleged benefits of the treaty program to that State, pointing particularly to the large increase in cigarette exports. Whether purposely or unintentionally I do not know, but Mr. Edminster failed to tell the good people of North Carolina that 91 percent of the increased exports of cigarettes went to nontreaty countries. Then, later in his address, he had the audacity to say that the opposition to the trade-treaty program was largely based upon "misinformation and misunderstanding."

#### MEMBERS WHO VOTED FOR TREATY PROGRAM ASK EXEMPTION OF THEIR PRODUCTS

I have no doubt but that many Members of the House and Senate who voted for the Reciprocal Tariff Act have grave misgivings about their action. It is of course an undeniable fact that many of these Members have appeared before the Committee for Reciprocity Information asking that no reductions be made under trade treaties on the products of their particular district or State. Of course the tariff has always been a "local issue" within the Democratic Party. When Republican tariff bills have been before this body, we have seen Democratic Members vote in favor of tariffs on the products of their section and then vote against the bill on final passage. So there is nothing inconsistent in their attitude of favoring the sacrifice of home industries to foreign competition so long as the industries sacrificed are not located in their own sections.

#### SELFISH POSITION OF PROPONENTS

I believe the record will show that the only defense of the trade-treaty program in this House has come from a few Members on the other side of the aisle who have one or two export products in their districts on which concessions have been obtained from some foreign country. While these Members are apparently willing to see industries and workers in other sections injured in the mere hope that the products of their own sections may find a larger outlet abroad, they overlook the fact that whatever increased market may be obtained abroad will be offset by an equal if not greater loss of sales in the home market to those who have been sacrificed in order that the foreign market might be obtained.

Let me illustrate the point in this way: Suppose we consider that the reduction made on British woolen goods under the British treaty was to enable American automobile producers to sell more cars to Great Britain. By reason of the destruction of our own woolen industry and throwing the employees out of their jobs, the motorcar industry loses one



or more sales in the home market for every additional sale it makes abroad. This cannot be denied.

#### BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION TO TREATY PROGRAM GROWING

It may or may not be significant, but the fact is that there are now pending before the Ways and Means Committee a number of bills seeking to repeal the Reciprocal Tariff Act and abrogate the treaties made thereunder. Others provide for Senate or House and Senate ratification. In the other body, one of the distinguished Members of the majority party has introduced a resolution (S. Res. 69, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), reading as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that foreign-trade agreements entered into under the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, are treaties which under the Constitution can be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and, there being nothing in such act which provides that such agreements should not be ratified by the Senate, as other treaties are ratified, it is the sense of the Senate that such agreements should be made effective only if the Senate has advised and consented to their ratification.

I cite this resolution merely as evidence of the growing bipartisan opposition to present trade-treaty methods. I concur in the view expressed in the foregoing resolution that the so-called trade agreements are in effect treaties and should be ratified by the Senate. In order for them to be valid as executive agreements, such as were negotiated under the Tariff Acts of 1890 and 1897, they must not involve the exercise of any legislative powers such as the President now has under the Reciprocal Tariff Act. As I pointed out in my remarks of January 10, 1939, the latter act lays down no legislative rule or formula to control the President in making rates, and he therefore exercises discretionary legislative authority contrary to the Constitution.

#### HOUSE SHOULD HAVE SAY IN TREATY RATIFICATION

While I agree that the present so-called trade agreements are in effect treaties, and are therefore subject to Senate confirmation, I do not believe that this alone would validate them. As the treaties affect the revenue, they cannot be made valid and operative, in my opinion, without the concurrent approval of the House of Representatives. As I discussed this phase of the question in my remarks last month, I shall not go into it again in detail. Whether viewed as treaties or as executive agreements, the present so-called trade agreements are in either case clearly unconstitutional.

#### UNJUSTIFIED CLAIMS OF TREATY PROPONENTS

Let us turn now to the practical side of the trade-treaty program. I have already referred in passing to the extravagant claims made by proponents of the program, and I now want to show you how unjustified these claims are. One of the principal arguments made in favor of the program is that under its operation, exports have increased more rapidly to treaty countries than to nontreaty countries, and hence it is contended that the trade treaties must be responsible for this increase. When we consider the total trade to treaty countries, and compare it with the total trade to nontreaty countries, it will be found that our exports increased faster to the first group, taken as a whole. However, when we come to analyze our export trade to individual treaty countries, the results are not so favorable to the treaty program. Trade-treaty proponents never present this side of the picture. Here are the facts:

#### EXPORTS TO NONTREATY COUNTRIES GREATER IN MANY CASES

Take first our trade with the South American countries. It will be found that our exports to several nontreaty countries in South America have increased a great deal more than our exports to many treaty countries. For example, comparing exports in the first 11 months of 1938 with the same period in 1935, our exports to Argentina, a nontreaty country, increased by 73 percent, while our exports to Brazil, a treaty country, increased by only 37 percent. Likewise, exports to Venezuela, a nontreaty country, increased by 178 percent, while exports to Colombia, a treaty country, increased by 81 percent.

Turning to Europe, we find that exports to Germany, a nontreaty country, which in addition is excluded from the benefits of our treaty concessions, increased by 26 percent as

against only a 21-percent increase in our exports to France, a treaty country. Exports to Norway, a nontreaty country, increased in approximately the same percentage as our exports to Sweden, a treaty country. Many other similar examples could be given, all of which tend to prove that there is absolutely no justification for the claim made by trade-treaty proponents that the treaty program is directly responsible for the larger increase in our export trade to treaty countries. If there were any basis for this claim, exports to individual treaty countries should consistently show a larger increase than exports to nontreaty countries, which we have seen is not the case.

#### TREATY PROGRAM DID NOT PREVENT EXPORT DECLINE LAST YEAR

If the trade-treaty program exerts such a beneficent influence upon our export trade, then why did it not prevent the sharp drop in our export trade last year to several of the larger treaty countries? I refer particularly to our exports to Canada, Cuba, Brazil, Belgium, and France. In the case of numerous nontreaty countries, notably Denmark, Soviet Russia, Ireland, Chile, and Venezuela, our exports were greater in 1938 than in 1937. All of which shows that it is a mere coincidence that our exports to treaty countries, taken as a unit, have increased faster than our exports to nontreaty countries, taken as a unit.

The same holds true of exports of agricultural products as applies to exports in general. In fact, there is not even any ground for arguing that the trade-treaty program has substantially benefited the major farm products, because few concessions of any consequence have as yet been obtained for such products. I referred to this matter in my remarks last month and shall not go over the ground again.

#### FAVORABLE TRADE BALANCE IN 1938 NOT DUE TO TRADE TREATIES

Trade-treaty proponents have called attention to the large favorable trade balance last year—that is, the excess of exports over imports—and have thrown out the inference that it is entirely due to the trade-treaty program. As a matter of fact, the treaty program had nothing whatever to do with it, and I will show you why. In the first place, the trade-treaty program was supposed to increase our export trade, yet exports declined last year by 7.6 percent over 1937. Thus our favorable trade balance last year was not due to any increase in exports. What, then, was responsible for it?

The answer is to be found in the fact that imports declined by more than \$1,000,000,000 last year over 1937. The circumstance that imports were less than exports gives us a favorable trade balance. But is the trade-treaty program to be given credit for the decline in imports? Not at all. The purpose of the trade-treaty program is not to discourage imports, but to encourage them. No tariff rates have ever been increased under the treaty program; they have only been lowered.

Thus we find that there is no ground whatever on which we can give the treaty program credit for the favorable trade balance last year. Yet we constantly hear proponents of the program pointing to the favorable trade balance as evidence of the benefits of the treaty program. This is further indication of the campaign of misrepresentation by which support for the program is sustained.

While the trade-treaty proponents now point with pride to the favorable trade balance, with which the trade-treaty program had nothing to do, I very well recall that one of the original arguments for the treaty program was that since we were a creditor nation it was "unhealthy" for us to have an excess of exports over imports. While I have never subscribed to this theory, I cite the argument merely to show how the trade-treaty proponents have changed their position.

#### REAL CAUSE FOR DECLINE IN IMPORTS IN 1938

While we have seen that the trade-treaty program was not responsible for the decline in imports last year we have not ascertained what was the real cause. The answer is to be found in the resumption of somewhat normal agricultural production in the United States, obviating the necessity for large imports of foreign agricultural products, and in the decline in purchasing power among our people due to the Roosevelt depression. This is not merely an opinion on my

part. It is corroborated in official departmental publications. In the November 5 issue of Commerce Reports it is stated:

Import trade reflected the recession in business activity and the improvement in agricultural production in the United States.

The Department of Agriculture, in the August 13, 1938, issue of Foreign Crops and Markets, states:

The decrease in business activity influences the value of practically all our imports, both agricultural and other. It was accompanied by lower prices and by a general falling off in demand. Raw materials were needed in smaller quantity by factories and finished products were purchased to a lesser extent by workers.

There is food for thought in these two quotations.

While the Tariff Act of 1930 was unjustly blamed for the depression of 1929, the fact is, on the other hand, that the Trade Treaty Act of 1934 did not prevent the Roosevelt depression of recent date. It did not prevent the decline in farm income over \$1,000,000,000 last year. It is very likely that the trade-treaty program was to some extent at least responsible for the Roosevelt depression, because it proceeds upon the fallacious principle that our prosperity at home is dependent upon the foreign market, whereas history has proved beyond any doubt that insofar as the United States is concerned, its prosperity is primarily dependent upon the home market.

#### PROSPERITY BASED ON HOME MARKET

The fact that our imports decline in times of depression and increase when we are prosperous definitely shows that our foreign trade will take care of itself when conditions at home are good; in other words, that increased foreign trade is a consequence, and not the cause, of domestic prosperity.

#### EXPORTS OF WAR MATERIALS A LARGE FACTOR IN PRESENT EXPORT TRADE

Just a word about the connection of war materials with our present export market. Trade-treaty proponents have tried without success to dispute the fact that our present export trade is sustained to a considerable extent by increasingly large exports of war materials. I have previously made the statement—and I stand by it—that if it had not been for the large exports of war materials in 1937 we would have had an unfavorable trade balance in that year. This is shown by the table inserted in the RECORD of April 12, 1938, by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

#### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS PROVE TRUTH OF CHARGE

I say now that the exports of war materials made up a large part of our total export trade in 1938, and that if it had not been for such exports, our total export trade would have declined last year by much more than 7.6 percent. Let me quote from the February 11, 1939, issue of Commerce Reports:

Exports of a number of manufactured articles for which demands in foreign countries had greatly increased in 1937, partly as a result of armament programs, continued to expand during 1938.

The article goes on to point out that exports of aircraft were several times larger in 1938 than in 1929, and also states that fuel-oil exports were above the 1929 total. On February 9 the majority leader in the other body inserted in the RECORD a statement by the Department of Commerce dealing with foreign trade. It contains this significant statement:

The demand for American machinery and metal manufactures has continued strong, due in a considerable measure to the heavy requirements of the rearmament programs of several European countries which have prevented those normally large exporting countries from supplying both export and domestic demands.

In view of these statements from the Department of Commerce, I trust that no Member on the majority side will now get up and try to deny—as several have done in the past—that a large part of our present export trade is in war materials.

#### ALLEGED PEACE PROGRAM SUSTAINED BY WAR EXPORTS

The preservation of peace is, as I have previously pointed out, one of the arguments now being used to sustain diminishing support for the trade-treaty program, but here we have the spectacle of the program being saved from complete disrepute by the large exports of war materials, with which it, of course, has no direct connection. The dove of peace thus feeds on armament exports.

#### MORE THAN 1,000 DUTY REDUCTIONS MADE UNDER TREATY PROGRAM

Let us now analyze the trade-treaty program from the standpoint of what it has done to our tariff structure. The Tariff Act of 1930 theoretically is still the law of the land, but it has been completely emasculated by the trade-treaty program. The United States Tariff Commission recently published a document of 171 pages showing changes made in the Tariff Act of 1930 under the flexible tariff and under the trade-treaty program. All but a few of the changes were made under the latter. In order to know what the tariff on a given article now is, you first look up the article in the Tariff Act of 1930 and then turn to this 171-page document of the Tariff Commission to see if the rate has been changed.

I have previously called the attention of the House to the fact that under the various trade treaties now in effect, some one-thousand-odd reductions in duties have been made. The result has been that this administration has brought about a piece-meal, but general, downward revision of the tariff.

Under the trade-treaty law, the President cannot reduce a duty by more than 50 percent. That is one provision of the act at least for which we can be thankful, but of course the fact remains that a 50-percent reduction is a rather drastic one.

#### SEVEN-TENTHS OF REDUCTIONS ARE OF MORE THAN 30 PERCENT

Now to what extent has the President availed himself of his authority to reduce tariffs the full 50 percent? I quote from an analysis of the treaty reductions, made by the American Tariff League. That organization found that the total number of reductions made under the treaty program (excluding the purely bilateral treaty with Cuba) total 1,056. Of this number, 365 rates, or over one-third, were reduced by the full 50 percent. One hundred and forty-four rates were reduced from 40 to 49 percent. Adding these to the first mentioned, we see that half the total number of reductions amounted to more than 40 percent. If we include the duties that have been reduced 30 percent or more, we find that the total covers seven-tenths of all the reductions. Let me repeat these figures, because they are important to bear in mind. They show what has been going on under the treaty program. Remember this: One-third the reductions have amounted to the full 50 percent; one-half are more than 40 percent; seven-tenths are more than 30 percent.

#### EIGHT-TENTHS OF REDUCTIONS BELOW LEVEL OF MODERATE 1922 RATES

If these figures are not sufficiently astounding to arouse the interest of the Members, then listen to what I am going to tell you now. Let us see how the reduced rates compare with the comparable rates under the 1922 Tariff Act, which was in existence before the act of 1930 was passed. The American Tariff League finds that only 928 of the 1,056 reduced rates can be compared directly with the 1922 rates, due to differences in classification, and so forth. Of this total, 776, or more than 83 percent, were reduced below the level of the comparable 1922 rates. Think of that! Over eight-tenths of the reductions below the level of the moderate 1922 rates. Is it any wonder that opposition to the trade-treaty program is growing by leaps and bounds?

#### WHOLE WORLD GETS BENEFIT OF OUR REDUCTIONS

It would be bad enough if the benefit of these reduced rates were only extended to the individual country with which a particular treaty is negotiated, but when we consider the fact that all the countries in the world save Germany get the benefit of our treaty reductions without giving us any reciprocal concessions in return, it becomes obvious that the trade-treaty program not only threatens the existence of domestic industries but will inevitably result in surrendering our rich domestic market for lean foreign markets.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I correctly understand that Cuba is the only country with which we have a trade agreement that does not extend to all other countries of the most-favored-nation clause insofar as the Cuban concessions are concerned?

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is correct in that statement. Cuba is the only one.



Mr. CRAWFORD. Looking forward to a proposition we will be considering here within a few days pertaining to the Philippine Islands, wherein the State Department is supporting a bill proposing that we extend the most-favored-nation clause to the Philippines until 1961, this will give us two countries where the most-favored-nation clause does not extend to other countries. Sometime when the gentleman has more time, if he cannot do it now, I wish the gentleman would comment on that phase of the Philippine situation.

Mr. TREADWAY. I should be very pleased to join the gentleman in some comment of that kind, because I know from personal experience that the gentleman from Michigan is very well posted both on the sugar situation in Cuba and the general trade situation in the Philippines, having toured that section within a very brief period of years. I should be pleased to take up a discussion of that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

#### PRESENT TREATY PROGRAM NOT TRULY RECIPROCAL

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the present trade-treaty program goes under the name of "reciprocity," but it has no right to that name. Reciprocity contemplates mutual benefits, but the present program is a strictly one-sided proposition in favor of foreign nations and against the interests of our own people.

The generalization of the treaty concessions is defended by the administration on the ground that concessions usually are made only with respect to products of which the treaty country is our chief source of supply. However, I have shown in past speeches upon this subject that this rule is not universally followed, and that in many instances which I have cited nontreaty countries have been the chief beneficiaries of our concessions without giving us anything in return.

#### ADMINISTRATION FAILS TO ENFORCE PROVISION OF LAW DENYING TREATY RATES TO CERTAIN NATIONS

In this connection I want to call attention to a provision of the Reciprocal Tariff Act which, if it were being enforced by the administration, would automatically deny the benefits of our treaty concessions to many countries which are now the objects of our generosity—or I should say of the administration's generosity. I refer to the provision which states that if any country discriminates against our commerce, it shall be denied the benefit of the most-favored-nation clause. That provision is not being enforced today. As I have indicated, only one country is on the blacklist despite the fact that many nations are actively discriminating against American commerce. This was admitted by Assistant Secretary of State Sayre before the Ways and Means Committee when that committee was considering the resolution to extend the life of the treaty program. It has also been admitted by another administration tariff spokesman—Commissioner Ryder, of the Tariff Commission—in an article appearing in the London Political Quarterly for December 1937. Thus under present procedure we are not only giving up our home market to the world without getting equivalent concessions in return but we are actually giving it up to many countries which are very definitely discriminating against our own goods.

Secretary Hull partially justifies the generalization of our concessions on the ground that we are thereby setting an example for world-wide removal of trade restrictions. Aside from the injury that results to American producers from this policy, the pitiful part is that the world is not following our example. As was stated in a recent publication of the Tariff Commission:

The policy of bilateral balancing of trade appears to have become more widely accepted in fact than in theory.

In other words, the world is proceeding along the lines of bilateral trading rather than along the lines of most-favored-nation treatment, as provided for under the present program. This is further proven by the article in yesterday's papers stating that Argentina would not enter into a most-favored-

nation treaty offered by the United States but wanted a strictly bilateral agreement.

#### MOST OF REDUCTIONS ARE ON COMPETITIVE FOREIGN PRODUCTS

Continuing with the discussion of the nature of the reductions made under the trade-treaty program, it is hardly necessary for me to remind the House that by far the great majority of the reductions were on foreign articles that directly compete with the products of our own agriculture, industry, and labor. Herein lies the chief objection to the present trade-treaty program, and I want to emphasize that fact as much as I can.

#### NO JUSTIFICATION FOR IMPORTING THINGS WE ALREADY HAVE

I have many times stated that the only purpose of foreign trade is to exchange our own surpluses for the things we need but do not produce ourselves. No one can successfully challenge that statement. The trade-treaty program, by encouraging and inviting increased imports of competitive products, surrenders our rich domestic market while it vainly attempts to build up our relatively unimportant foreign market. There cannot possibly be any gain to the Nation thereby. It is only when foreign trade is carried on without injury to our own people that it is profitable. Nothing is gained when for every additional dollar's worth of foreign trade an American export industry obtains, a dollar's worth or more of domestic trade must be taken from some other American industry and given up to foreign producers. Nor is it fair or in accordance with the doctrine of "equal rights for all and special privileges for none," to strike down one American industry or one group of American workers in an effort to help the export trade of another American industry or another group of American workers.

Anyone who accepts the principle that the only justification for foreign trade is the exchange of our own surpluses for things we need but cannot produce ourselves necessarily cannot support the present trade-treaty program. Not only does it work an injury on our own people and our national economy, but it involves a needless sacrifice of the American market.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TREADWAY. I dislike very much not to yield to my friend from Virginia, but I have so many more items to cover I should like to proceed. I am sure the gentleman has ample arguments of his own with which he always favors the House.

There is an ample demand in this country for noncompetitive products to provide foreigners with money with which to buy our own products. It is suicidal to continue to follow the present policy of allowing foreign producers to furnish us not only with the things we need but also with the things we already have in abundance and thereby displace our own products and take away the means of livelihood of large segments of our own people.

#### NO ONE SEEKS EXORBITANT TARIFFS FOR UNITED STATES

Trade-treaty proponents take the attitude that all criticism of the present trade-treaty program arises from those who want to fasten exorbitant tariff rates on the country and shut out all foreign imports. They also take the attitude that all who espouse the doctrine of reciprocity must necessarily support the present alleged reciprocity program 100 percent. I should like to discuss these two propositions very briefly.

The first hardly needs an answer, it being so patently absurd. All Republicans have ever demanded in the way of tariff rates is the equalization of foreign advantages in costs of production. No one could successfully contend that a rate which merely put the American producer on the same footing as the foreign producer was exorbitant or constituted an embargo rate.

If any of the rates of existing law are too high—exorbitant—they can be reduced to a proper level under the flexible tariff provisions which the Republican Party wrote into the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930. These provisions are still law, although the present administration has not made much use

of them—certainly not to adjust rates upward where conditions demanded.

PRESENT RECIPROCITY PROGRAM ENTIRELY DIFFERENT FROM THAT SPONSORED BY MCKINLEY

As to the second proposition just stated, I want to say that there are all kinds of reciprocity, and just because a person is favorable to the general policy of reciprocity he is not thereby committed to the support of the present program of pseudo reciprocity. From time to time reference has been made by trade-treaty proponents to the fact that President McKinley was a great exponent of reciprocity. Quotations have been read from some of his speeches as endorsing the present alleged reciprocity program. If McKinley knew this, I am sure he would turn over in his grave. The present program is about as far from the type of reciprocity that he and the Republican Party have sponsored as the North Pole is from the South. Those who have quoted from McKinley in support of the present trade-treaty program have purposely failed to give a complete statement of his views. They have lifted certain sentences from the context of his speeches without adding the qualifying words.

PRESIDENT MCKINLEY'S EXPOSITION OF TRUE PURPOSE OF RECIPROCITY

I have many times read to this House McKinley's version of the true principles and purpose of reciprocity. I will do so again, because apparently there are some who neither heard nor read the quotation to which I refer. President McKinley, in his inaugural address of March 4, 1897, speaking of the object of reciprocity, said that the "end in view" was always to be—

The opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people but tend to increase their employment.

Now that is a definite, clear-cut statement, which is not subject to any misinterpretation or misconstruction. Under McKinley's conception of reciprocity, concessions would only be made on noncompetitive foreign products. Under the present program, most concessions have been on competitive products which involve a loss of labor to our own people and tend to increase unemployment. Herein is the difference between the two concepts of reciprocity.

Under McKinley, reciprocity went hand in hand with protection for American agriculture, industry, and labor. Under the present program, protection for American producers has been abandoned. Duties have been reduced far below the cost-of-production differential.

REDUCTIONS NOT CONFINED TO "EXCESSIVE" RATES AS CLAIMED

I recall that when Secretary Hull appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in 1937 in connection with the resolution to extend the life of the treaty program, I asked him some questions relative to the necessity for maintaining tariff protection. He replied that the question of tariff protection per se did not arise in connection with the treaty program, adding:

This program calls merely for dealing with excessive, unreasonable, and trouble-breeding restraints and restrictions on trade.

If the Secretary had confined his reductions under the trade-treaty program to duties which were in truth "excessive and unreasonable"—if any there be—I am sure there would be no widespread opposition to the treaty program today. But he has not done so, as evidenced by the drastic reductions made on over a thousand articles, eight-tenths of the reductions being below the level of the moderate 1922 rates, half of which had not been increased when the 1930 act was passed. We all recall the statement made by Mr. Roosevelt in 1932 that he did not consider any of the agricultural tariffs to be excessive and would not reduce them, yet the Secretary of State, with the President's approval, has reduced the duties on a long list of farm products, many of them the full 50 percent permitted under the Trade Treaty Act.

A CONCRETE ILLUSTRATION OF ADVERSE EFFECT OF TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Trade-treaty proponents will contend that I am unduly alarmed about the prospect of injury to American interests

LXXXIV—96

by reason of the reductions under the trade-treaty program. I could very well answer by saying that they in turn are unduly optimistic about the benefits which they seem to think will flow from the treaty program. However, I would rather answer by a definite, concrete illustration of what the treaty program is doing. I hold in my hand an advertisement being circulated in this country by a British tailoring concern, announcing that their representative will be in certain cities at certain hotels on certain dates to solicit orders for British-made suits. At the bottom of the front side of the card a sticker has been attached on which there is printed in bold red type the following:

Owing to the new trade agreement the duty on imported clothing is now only 30 percent, which makes a reduction of approximately \$15 per suit.

Now this is a direct tangible result of the trade-treaty program, and we can see how it works out in actual practice. Here is a British concern soliciting orders in America with a view to depriving American tailors of the opportunity to furnish clothing from fabrics made by American workmen out of American wool. Of course, that is exactly what the trade-treaty proponents want, namely, to give foreign producers a greater share of the home market.

ADVERSE EFFECTS SOMETIMES INDIRECT

Even where the reduction in our tariff rates does not directly result in the displacement of American products, it does have the indirect effect of forcing down the price structure, and with it the general level of our wage and living standards. When duties are reduced our producers must reduce their costs so as to compete with the products of cheap foreign labor. They reduce profits, they reduce wages, they get along with less help—anything to enable them to meet the competition. This is why the adverse results of the reductions do not always show up immediately in increased foreign imports. But the effect is just as harmful. Of course, where the American producer, even by going to these lengths, cannot meet the foreign price, he must throw up the sponge, close down his factory, and dismiss his employees.

On February 8, 1939, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. SANDAGER] inserted in the RECORD a statement showing that the French trade agreement had cost workers in the American lace industry \$3,500,000 in wages annually. Now that is just one industry. Add the loss of wages to workers in other industries by reason of the trade-treaty program and you will have a staggering total. We must keep in mind that approximately half the total number of reductions were made under the British treaty, which only became effective on January 1 of this year. After it has come fully into operation and the whole world begins to take advantage of the reductions made thereunder it will, in my opinion, have a very serious effect upon American workers, not only by depriving them of employment in many instances but by reducing the wage scale of those who are still fortunate enough to retain their jobs.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. In connection with our domestic industries being affected, I wish to read a brief paragraph from a letter from Mr. E. H. Cooley, manager of the Massachusetts Fisheries Association, in which he states:

Canadian smoked fillets are quoted this morning on the Boston fish pier at from 11½ to 13 cents per pound, when the lowest cost of production in Boston is 14½ cents a pound, this being the cost of production, not including any profit whatever.

In other words, under that agreement Canadian fish are being sold in this country at less than the cost of production here.

Mr. TREADWAY. I thank the gentleman.

INCONSISTENCY OF ADMINISTRATION'S INTERNAL AND FOREIGN TRADE POLICIES

We have yet to hear any proponent of the trade-treaty program attempt to reconcile the inconsistency between the



administration's domestic program and its foreign trade program. Perhaps this is understandable, because it would involve the difficult task of justifying its policy of curtailing American crops while encouraging farm imports from abroad; of trying to reopen employment opportunities in industry while giving foreign workers greater opportunities to furnish the goods consumed in our own market; and of increasing costs of production at home by various policies while giving foreign producers a greater competitive advantage in the American market than they had before by drastic tariff reductions. This inconsistent policy has not been justified or explained because it cannot be.

#### LABOR MOST ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY INADEQUATE TARIFFS

The burden of inadequate tariffs falls principally upon the shoulders of labor, and no policy could be more at cross-purposes with the effort to raise wages and improve labor standards than the collateral policy of tearing down our tariff structure. Present reductions affect 40 percent of our imports, which means that a serious threat to the welfare of American workers is involved therein.

#### PROSPERITY CANNOT BE RESTORED BY TARIFF REDUCTIONS

I believe that anyone who will give serious thought to the question will come to the inescapable conclusion that we cannot restore prosperity in America by indiscriminate lowering of the protective tariff; that we cannot maintain existing wage and living standards, let alone increase them, by subjecting our workers to direct competition with the products of the low-wage countries of the rest of the world; that we cannot raise the income of our farmers or the price level of agricultural products by inviting foreign countries to flood our home market with farm products; or that we cannot revive industry and encourage reemployment by permitting foreign producers to supply the goods consumed in the American market at prices which our own manufacturers cannot meet.

#### THREAT OF TARIFF REDUCTIONS CONTRIBUTES TO UNCERTAINTY

One of the greatest drawbacks to recovery is the uncertainty as to the future. Yet under the trade-treaty program there constantly hangs over every American industry dependent upon tariff protection—both agricultural and manufacturing—like a sword of Damocles, the possibility that the tariff protection which has enabled it to compete in the home market with foreign producers and pay the American scale of wages to its employees will be withdrawn. It is no wonder when we add to the ruinous tariff policy the other administration policies that contribute to fear and uncertainty as to the future and reduce the possibility of profitable enterprise, that American business and industry is in a state of the jitters. Nor is it any wonder that the farmers of the country, with their foreign market destroyed by the program of scarcity and artificial price stimulation, with their home market gradually being surrendered to the foreign producer, with millions of American workers, who constitute the farmer's greatest and richest market, out of jobs, and with the balance threatened with a lower standard of living by reason of industrial tariff reductions. I say it is no wonder that the farmers of the country are in a state of despair.

#### RESTORATION OF REASONABLE TARIFF PROTECTION WOULD BE BIG STEP TOWARD RECOVERY

In my opinion, the restoration of a reasonable level of protection for the products that we are capable of producing in America would be as big a step in bringing about recovery as any that could be taken. By "reasonable protection," I mean, of course, such tariffs as would equalize competitive conditions in the home market and give our own producers at least an equal opportunity to supply domestic needs.

#### THE RELATION OF TARIFF PROTECTION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Before concluding, I want to call attention to a phase of the tariff question to which little attention has been paid, but which is very apropos at this time, when there is before Congress legislation providing for the national defense. I wonder if it occurred to any of the Members—either yesterday or the day before, when this legislation was before the House—the important part which the protective tariff plays in contribut-

ing to the national defense. It would seem to me that at a time when all the world is arming to the teeth and in every way preparing for the emergency which seems inevitable but which we all hope may never occur, it would seem to me that at this time we should go rather slow in destroying our own industries and making ourselves dependent on foreign nations for our needs.

One of the industries essential to national defense is the iron and steel industry, yet the administration has in numerous instances made drastic reductions in the tariffs on iron and steel products which are vital to national defense. I do not mean that the particular products are necessary, but it is essential to maintain certain industries manufacturing purely commercial products whose plants, in the event of war, can be converted into the production of war matériel. I believe that the Secretary of War will bear out this statement.

Under the recent British treaty the duty on woollens was reduced. If war comes, we will need woollen goods to provide uniforms for our soldiers, and we do not want to be dependent upon Great Britain for such goods, because it may be difficult to get them across the water through a possible submarine blockade. I could give any number of similar illustrations. Not only do we need the factories, but we need the skilled hands to turn out the products.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT REALIZES THE NECESSITY FOR PROTECTION

In this connection, I would like to cite a letter written by Secretary of War Good to the Ways and Means Committee at the time it was considering the tariff bill of 1930.

Secretary Good asked that the committee give protection to the domestic production of certain types of steel cylinders used in peaceful pursuits, because the factory could be readily converted to the manufacture of guns in the event of war. I quote a brief passage:

The process of construction of these cylinders, like the process of construction of guns, requires skilled and specialized labor. Such skilled and specialized labor could be readily diverted from cylinder making to gun making; but if such labor were not on hand and skilled in this work, it would take a number of months to train it to such work.

Without reading the balance of the letter, I shall insert it in its entirety at this point:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, March 7, 1929.

HON. WILLIS C. HAWLEY,  
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAWLEY: In recent years the Midvale Co., of Philadelphia, have developed steel vessels and cylinders, together with their methods of manufacture, which are used in the fertilizer, chemical, power, oil, and other industries. In some cases these cylinders are up to 90 inches in diameter and over 50 feet in length, weighing as much as 250,000 pounds. The largest size requires a steel ingot weighing more than 200 tons to start its manufacture. The methods of manufacture and the machinery utilized in manufacture of these cylinders would be an extremely valuable asset to the United States in event of war, as furnishing a facility which could be readily converted to the manufacture of large guns.

In addition, these particular cylinders are utilized in improved methods of cracking crude and low-grade oils and in the manufacture of synthetic ammonia, both of which industries would be very vital to this country in a national emergency. In the manufacture of these cylinders the Midvale Co. is met with considerable competition from abroad, particularly from the Krupp Co., of Germany, who are using their gun-making machinery for the making of these cylinders.

Quite generally the gun-making machinery in our large steel companies, which was installed before the World War and which was greatly expanded in its extent during the World War, has now been laid aside or scrapped, and the making and installation of similar machinery in event of another emergency would take so much time as to very greatly delay the production of vital guns.

The War Department therefore looks upon the production of these heavy forged steel cylinders and the machinery for fabricating them as a very great asset to national defense not only from the standpoint of the making of guns but also from that of the making of gasoline and ammonia.

The process of construction of these cylinders, like the process of construction of guns, requires skilled and specialized labor. Such skilled and specialized labor could be readily diverted from cylinder making to gun making, but if such labor were not on hand and skilled in this work, it would take a number of months to train it to such work.

I therefore urge upon your committee the high desirability from a point of view of national defense of giving to this particular indus-

try the protection that is necessary in order that the manufacture of these cylinders and vessels be continued in this country.

Very sincerely,

JAMES W. GOOD, *Secretary of War.*

The foregoing letter relates to one particular industry, but there are many others which are equally essential to national defense. We should not jeopardize our national defense by destroying these industries through drastic tariff reductions.

#### TREATY PROGRAM HAS BEEN TRIED AND FOUND WANTING

To return more particularly to the trade-treaty program, I would like, before I conclude my remarks, Mr. Chairman, to read a brief quotation from a speech recently made by President Munro, of the American Tariff League, to which I subscribe 100 percent. Said he:

We have had 4½ years of the trade-agreement program. Much of the policy has obviously been inconsistent with practices at home, and as we have reviewed the record, it has failed equally of developing our export market or of contributing materially to world peace. In addition, it has laid the foundation for a period of foreign competition more devastating than any we have ever experienced in the United States. I believe that the trade-agreement program has had time enough for a fair trial, and that in its present form it has been found wanting.

Mr. Chairman, the more study I give to the administration's trade-treaty program, the more sure I become that it is not in the interest of the American people. It divests Congress of its right to legislate; it permits emissaries of foreign governments to have a hand in determining this country's tariff policy with which is ultimately bound up the welfare of the entire Nation; it encourages importations of foreign products of farm and factory which we already produce for ourselves and thereby takes away the means of livelihood of our own people and aggravates our unemployment problem; it trades off our rich domestic market for lean foreign markets; it sacrifices domestic industries and workers engaged in production for the home market, in which is consumed nine-tenths of what we produce, in what has been a futile effort to help other industries and workers engaged in export trade; and it undermines and destroys the protective tariff system under which our Nation has become the greatest and richest in the world.

It is this sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, that will lead to a turn-over in the election next year. This information is going to reach the voting public between now and the elections of 1940. While we divest ourselves of our right to write tariff bills and place that right in the hands of our competitors in foreign countries, the voters here at home will, with full information before them, see to it that this foolish trade-treaty program is certainly wiped off the statute books as a result of the election that will come in the fall of 1940.

It has failed to accomplish the purposes for which it was intended, but instead has aggravated our economic problems. The Reciprocal Tariff Act should be speedily repealed and the trade treaties entered into thereunder promptly abrogated insofar as they involve reductions in duty on competitive foreign products.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman venture the prognostication that the cotton States will be looking for a tariff on cotton within the next few years?

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, I think they will probably need it if they are to continue to survive down there, in view of the great expansion and development of cotton production in many countries.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. Did the gentleman notice a statement of Secretary Ickes asking for an appropriation for the relief of the Puerto Ricans who have been made destitute by the Cuban trade agreement?

Mr. TREADWAY. That is another illustration of the point I have been trying to make for the last three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CULKIN. Has the gentleman noted that the distinguished Secretary of State who claims that these trade agreements make for peace, is now the chief proponent in the administration, next to the President, of strong armament here in America?

Mr. TREADWAY. There is, of course, an inconsistency in considering the trade-treaty program as a method of securing peace and at the same time, as the gentleman from New York has said, increasing our armament by such a tremendous sum as indicated in the appropriation of yesterday.

Mr. CULKIN. That is a confession on the part of the Secretary of State that this policy has failed.

Mr. TREADWAY. There is no question about it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that in October 1932 our President, then a candidate, made this assertion and upon this assertion gained the votes of millions of American farmers?

I do not intend to lower the tariff on agricultural products, because by so doing it would be entirely inconsistent with my ideas upon the farm question.

Mr. TREADWAY. He not only did that, but he promised the people economy in appropriations and a reduction in the expenses of the Government, and his accomplishments along that line have certainly been a great failure.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And he was going to lead the way in that respect.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has the gentleman read what the press has had to say with reference to the Argentine, I believe it is, in the last few days, which interested me very much in this connection? I am informed that between 1933 and 1937 the percentage of increase in our exports to Cuba, a reciprocity-agreement country, increased 291 percent, while in the case of Chile, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, with which we did not have trade agreements, the increases in trade were 349 percent, 286 percent, 264 percent, and 255 percent, respectively. As I understand, we do have a trade treaty with Brazil. Is that correct?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman think there is any danger in the Brazilian situation working around to what the newspapers now indicate with reference to Argentina and further embarrassing our situation there?

Mr. TREADWAY. I believe some of the high officials of Brazil are here now kowtowing to this Government in an endeavor to secure loans with which to buy our own goods. Is not that correct?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is correct.

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, that is a good example of the situation.

I hope this study of the trade treaties will be generally carried on throughout this session of the Congress, because, to my mind, there is nothing of more value to the American people. [Applause.]

I thank the members of the Committee for their attention.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose in the time allotted to me today to give the members of this Committee, insofar as I can, the whole story about a phase of this legislation which was rather generally discussed on the floor this morning, but in which discussion I was not permitted to greatly participate.



The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], the very able chairman of this subcommittee, who, I am sure, has done an excellent job in most respects, did not tell you the whole story in this connection, naturally, because of the fact that his is a big job. He is a big cog in the wheels of a very important committee. Time was not available for him to go into the details of every little phase of his bill. Consequently, as I understood him, he only gave you the last phases of this matter. I refer to the reduction of—I do not know how much it is now, but it was \$135,000 once, and I have heard it referred to as \$125,000 and as \$120,000. I have forgotten what the amount was that was used in the debate today, with respect to the appropriation for publishing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As I say, I am sure the Appropriations Committee has done a good job as it sees it. I am sure it has honestly performed its duty as it saw its duty, despite the fact that I think it very greatly erred under the conditions with respect to this particular matter.

I became a member of the House Committee on Printing, and as such of the Joint Committee on Printing, less than a year ago. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan said this morning that this matter had been in the lap of his committee for 2 years. Consequently I may also be guilty of not giving the House the whole picture, because I do not know what occurred prior to last March, but I shall tell you the whole story since then.

My first information of a proposed change in the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD came from a letter from the Public Printer last November, I believe, in which he stated that he wrote at the instance of the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, and he submitted with that letter what I call a brief, and not being a lawyer, just as I am not a printer, it may not be a brief, but I took it to be one, stating his reasons for believing that this change would be beneficial.

Among them was the fact that \$135,000 would be saved. Needless to say, the prospect of such an economy greatly appealed to me. He requested that I express my reaction to that change to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing by December 15. Along with that letter, in addition to the brief, came this set of descriptions, I suppose you would call it, of the change—a so-called comparison between the new and old publication. Mind you, I said "this set." That is set No. 1. That is the set that came to the attention of the Joint Committee on Printing in November or December, and we will lay that aside. It came with the statement that that was the best change that could be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That was a great change, and would save \$135,000. In compliance with that letter I wrote the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing on December 13, and I read a paragraph from that letter:

I have read these recommendations very carefully and studied the exhibits which accompany them. As a result, I am strongly of the opinion that they should be approved unless you are aware of some objection to doing so with which I am unfamiliar.

I did not hear any more from that. I did not know what action the committee took, but I did hear in passing along in the corridor—from whom I do not know, and I cannot recall it exactly—a remark that the older Members or the leaders or something to that effect—I am not sure of the quotation—of the House and the Senate vetoed that No. 1 proposal.

The next thing I heard was when the distinguished chairman of the legislative committee came to me in the cloak room a week ago day before yesterday—Tuesday, February 7—and asked me if I could get my committee together and join him in his committee room up in the corner within an hour and a half, or something to that effect. I told him I would gladly try, and he told me what he wanted—to discuss this No. 1 proposal. I stated that I had already voted for that provisionally and supposed I was for it unless there was something about it with which I was unfamiliar. He said, "Yes; I have your correspondence." At the appointed time my committee went to his committee room. It is my privilege to preside over my small committee, and it is small, but it is

important. It is by no means the size nor of the importance of the Committee on Appropriations, and yet it is a committee which I believe is entitled to its integrity.

We met up there and we were again shown No. 1, the format, and I read the subcommittee the paragraph which I have just read to you. I called their attention to the fact that my first impression was for it, but suggested they notice that I made a reservation. I did not know what the elder statesmen thought of this, and just because I happen to be chairman of a committee I did not think it behooved me to take the bit in my mouth and give him the letter that he requested. He wanted me to give him a letter to the effect that the House Committee on Printing approved it, and I said I left that reservation in the letter to Chairman Lambeth, because I did not believe it behooved me to take the bit in my mouth and put over a proposition whether or no. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, my colleague on the committee [Mr. RICH], was present.

He stated that he wrote the chairman of the joint committee about as I did, except his reservation was that if the Public Printer could do what he said he could do—that is, save \$135,000—he was for it. The other member of the committee was present, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a very able member of this House and of this committee, a man who is going to accomplish much on any committee on which he serves or in any capacity in which he functions, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY]. He had not seen No. 1, and we thought at the time it was advisable for the committee to know what it was doing. So I suggested that Mr. CONNERY take this exhibit No. 1 home and study it, which he did. Mind you, I had told the committee, and so had the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that we had voted for this with certain reservations.

Mr. CONNERY took exhibit No. 1 home that night, thinking that was what he was called upon to act on. The more I thought about the matter, and Mr. CONNERY shared my view, the more I wanted to know. I knew that I had voted on this matter on December 13. I presumed that the membership of the joint committee had all voted on it. I wanted to know what that vote was. I wanted the joint committee to perform its proper function and not be pushed around. Consequently, I engaged in a conversation, which I was requested to keep in confidence, which convinced me that there was good reason not only that I not give the gentleman the letter he desired, but that the change not be made.

Of course, I wanted to learn from my predecessor, chairman of this committee, who, different from me, was also chairman of the joint committee, what happened as a result of that vote. So I wired my distinguished predecessor, that lovable gentleman, Walter Lambeth, down in Carolina, where I hope he is thoroughly enjoying the rest which he so richly deserves, and I quoted this paragraph I have quoted to you and asked him what was the result of that vote. In reply I received a wire from his secretary to the effect that Walter would be out of town until next week, but that I would find what I wished in a telegram from him to the Public Printer dated December 29 and in a letter of December 23; if that did not give me what I wished, she would contact him and wire me further.

I contacted the Public Printer and requested copies of these communications. Instead of copies he sent me the originals. When I read that letter and that telegram, my mind was made up, that I not only should not give this committee a letter stating that the Committee on Printing of the House approved this change without further action of the joint committee, but that I should protest the change, because of the action of my predecessor, taken in good faith, little more than a month ago, since which the joint committee had had no opportunity to act.

So last Saturday I called the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], chairman of the subcommittee, and read him the telegram. He just waived it aside. He said, "I have got some new dope. Are you going to be in your office all day?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Can you come up

here directly when the Public Printer and some others come?" I said, "Yes." He said, "I will call you." And he did.

I went again to his office. A partial membership of the committee was there, the Public Printer was there, as was Mr. Ansel Wold, the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing. I was immediately shown some other exhibits, entirely different from those that were distributed to us in November or December. They were shown to me by the distinguished gentleman with the statement that they were far superior to what I assumed was alleged to be the best thing possible back in November. Time does not permit me to explain the difference, but there is quite a difference. I will say, too, for the gentleman who I understand is the father of this, that I believe it to be an improvement over No. 1. But I asked the chairman of the committee, "Where did that come from and when?" He said, "I went down to Mr. Wold's office yesterday and he prepared this and the Public Printer prepared these samples—or whatever you call them—last night."

He took me to task for calling it a "format" this morning. I am not a printer. I do not know what it is. But the Public Printer prepared that, and they had it there that morning. I said, "Mr. RABAUT, do you mean to tell me that Mr. Wold is the only one connected with the Joint Committee on Printing who has seen this until now, and yet you expect me to approve it?" I have forgotten his reply, but it was to the effect that "it was so good." Of course, I immediately gave him to understand that I could not approve it. I said to the committee that I wanted to read them the law on the subject and also a telegram which I had read to the chairman over the telephone.

I need not read to you distinguished and learned members of this Committee the law, because you know the law, but I would like to put it in the RECORD, so, if you will permit me, I shall read the law which covers this subject:

The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style, type, spacing, etc., of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of the proceedings, shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the session of Congress and at the close thereof.

That is the law on the subject. Did you hear anything there about the Committee on Appropriations?

Then I read this telegram, and in doing so I can but express the opinion that I misunderstood the distinguished chairman of this committee this morning, although I asked him and he repeated it, when I thought he said that the only objection to this change was in the Senate. I must have misunderstood him, although, as stated, I asked him and he repeated it, because I read this telegram to him and his associates on the committee that morning, having previously read it to him over the telephone.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; gladly.

Mr. RABAUT. Did the gentleman look upon the suggestion with favor or disfavor when he first came to my office, in his opinion—not in my opinion, but in his own opinion. Did the gentleman look upon it with favor or disfavor?

Mr. JARMAN. Decidedly with favor, but with the reservation expressed in that letter; but that was a different format.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes. You did not accord me that courtesy this morning, but I am glad to yield further.

Mr. RABAUT. Oh, I beg your pardon. I did yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I am mistaken again.

Mr. RABAUT. If you looked at it with favor, as you just said you did, I never had it in mind that you were unfavorable to it, and with that encouragement I went forward with the new RECORD.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. I yield further to the gentleman, if he desires.

Mr. RABAUT. No. I just wanted to say to the gentleman that his favorable attitude toward it was what encouraged me to go further and see if we could have an improved format. We do not say that this is the format that should be taken.

Mr. JARMAN. Which one are you talking about?

Mr. RABAUT. I am talking about the one we were talking about this morning. I am not trying to confuse the issue. I want to clarify it.

Mr. JARMAN. That is No. 3. I have not gotten to that yet. I was still talking about No. 2.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, that is out of the picture so far as the one I am talking about is concerned. There will be a greater saving in using format No. 2 rather than No. 3.

The suggestion is only that the committee wanted to back up the right we thought we had to make this saving, with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, and we think the gentleman's committee will act favorably. If the committee does not act favorably, then the Government Printing Office can come back and ask for additional appropriation from the deficiency committee.

Mr. JARMAN. I ask the gentleman if he does not remember me telling him in his room or in the committee room substantially this—of course, I may leave out the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" or something—but does not the gentleman remember my saying to him: "Mr. Chairman," or "Mr. RABAUT," or "Louis," or whatever I said:

If you will proceed in the normal, the legal way, as indicated by the law I quoted, and not cut this appropriation now but permit the Joint Committee on Printing to perform its proper function without duress, as far as I am concerned as an individual and as probably the vice chairman of the committee, if I do not change my mind and still feel that it is a good thing, I will pledge you my best efforts toward action by that committee, which, of course, would mean the same thing, because if you do not cut the appropriation and the committee puts this into effect by the use of either one of these three styles, naturally the difference would be covered back into the Treasury.

Does the gentleman remember my telling him that?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I would like to ask the gentleman one question. Was it on the gentleman's first or second appearance before the committee that he made that statement?

Mr. JARMAN. I think it was my second.

Mr. RABAUT. The first time the gentleman came before the committee I was encouraged to proceed. I noticed a great change when he came the second time, but I could not account for it.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman, I am sure, remembers calling me over yonder in the corner the morning following my first appearance before his committee, does he not, and asking me what I was going to do about that letter; and I told him that after having had this confidential conversation I had wired Walter Lambeth, and that I wanted to wait until I received a reply? Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I do.

Mr. JARMAN. That was early in the morning.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. JARMAN. Then in the afternoon he told me that they had already talked about this format. That they were ready to come before this House and ask for a cut in the appropriation and were going to stand by that decision and could take no other attitude despite my protest and the wire from the former chairman of the committee.

Mr. RABAUT. But the gentleman did not take that attitude until after the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONNERY] spoke, until after he refused to sign the letter.

Mr. JARMAN. After?

Mr. RABAUT. That was the first time the gentleman came before us objecting to it.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield and ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to answer the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONNERY. For the information of my very able colleague from Alabama and for the information of the gentleman from Michigan, if he will remember correctly, my reason



for not being willing to sign any letter of approval was because the time I was asked to do so was the first information I had of this proposition. Being a new member of the joint committee I did not feel that it was proper for me to sign something about which I had no knowledge whatsoever.

Mr. JARMAN. I agree with the gentleman on that and thank him.

Mr. CONNERY. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure my able chairman and colleague from Alabama will readily agree with me that the gentleman from Michigan has as fine a labor record as any Member of this House during his entire career in the House of Representatives; but, Mr. Chairman, there is a certain angle here that must not be overlooked, and I would like to quote an excerpt from a letter which I, as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, received from the Public Printer with reference to this change. At one point the Public Printer states:

There are normally in the Office—

Meaning the Government Printing Office—

8,000 jobs upon which the employees can be used at all times. The lessening of the time required to produce the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will enable this Office to use the time of those people to produce other congressional work and departmental work, and will assist us in placing ourselves on a more nearly current basis.

The Public Printer states, to repeat: "The lessening of the time required to produce." I emphasized, you will note, the word "time."

I say that that lessening of time is a lessening of labor, and if \$100,000 or \$125,000 is to be saved on the production of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 70 to 80 percent of the saving is going to be made at the expense of labor. Referring to the statement made by the Public Printer that the Printing Office is now operating 3 months behind schedule, it seems to me that, instead of a reduction of the appropriation, there should be an increase in the appropriation to provide for additional personnel. There should be no cutting of this appropriation by any \$125,000.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank my able colleague for his contribution.

The chairman of the committee has intimated that I changed my mind because of the opinion of my able colleague from Massachusetts. I say to him that if I were going to be a follower, I know of no one I would prefer to follow than him; but, as a matter of fact—and I cannot refrain from calling his attention to it—he must know that I had other reasons than that, because he heard this telegram read twice, and I answer his inquiry about whether I changed my mind at the instance of the able gentleman from Massachusetts by reading this telegram, which was my main reason for changing my mind if I did. I did not really change it, because I had that reservation all along. This telegram is dated December 29, 3 days before Mr. Lambeth served his time out as a Member of this House, as able chairman of the Committee on Printing of this House, and as the equally able chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing of the two Houses.

Mr. A. E. GIEGENGACK.

Re tel.:

Heartily approve changed masthead, exhibit D.

That is something else that is not concerned here.

Wold—

He is the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing—

writes 27th that Speaker BANKHEAD, Representatives RAYBURN, WOODRUM, MARTIN of Massachusetts, Vice President, and Senator McNARY strongly oppose three-column format. Suggest you lay the entire matter before Senator HAYDEN—

Who will become chairman of the joint committee—

Personally, I will concur in his judgment. Regret difficulties account not being able to come to Washington and absence from office until this afternoon.

WALTER LAMBETH, M. C.

Mr. Chairman, that is what made me take advantage of the reservation I made rather than anything else.

I must conclude with one or two more things.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my colleague and friend, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice in the report on this bill the following statement:

Under the law the Joint Committee on Printing is vested with authority to fix the format of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and members of the joint committee are now considering the advisability of making the proposed change.

May I ask if the joint committee has reached any decision in favor of the changed format?

Mr. JARMAN. None whatever. It reached a decision on December 29 against the change, and it has had no meeting since.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I observe a table of figures set out on page 20 of the report. It seems that the amount budgeted for the Government Printing Office would be reduced \$135,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask this question: The full amount for the regular format was allowed by the Budget?

Mr. JARMAN. That is what I understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And this reduction has really been below the Budget figure?

Mr. JARMAN. That is as I understand it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Appropriations Committee in appropriating money based on the new format is really doing so ahead of any action on the part of the legislative committee?

Mr. JARMAN. Absolutely. It is doing so contrary to the action of the legislative committee taken on December 29, which has been explained.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. For the further information of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] may I clarify his statement by saying not only before any action was taken but before the Joint Committee on Printing has even started to consider the proposition or has even had the matter laid before them for consideration. There has been no meeting of the Committee on Printing to take up this matter.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. It is all very well to talk about pushing the committee around and to speak of certain responsibilities. We did not push the committee around, because your committee has until the last deficiency bill to make a decision in this matter. Your committee has had this matter before it, not just since you have been chairman of the committee on the House side or vice chairman of the entire committee, but just as long as it has been placed before the Committee on Appropriations. The Appropriations Committee for 2 successive years has had the Public Printer walk into its meeting and say: "Gentlemen, if you wish to save \$135,000 on the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it can be done in this form."

The Committee on Appropriations did not take cognizance of the request last year, but it thought that this year it should recognize that it could save some money.

If the Joint Committee on Printing does not feel the Public Printer is correct, after due study has been given the subject, it can very well refuse to order the change and submit all the reasons it finds for making such decision. If the committee refuses, then it is up to the Public Printer to return to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for a new appropriation to cover the cut that has been made by the Committee on Appropriations. If the Committee on Printing finds he is correct and that committee can concur, the two committees will then be in accord, and the RECORD will be brought out in some other form than now, thereby effecting the saving. That is the only position my committee takes. It does not seek to legislate. It just seeks to reduce the appropriation for the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is entirely within the jurisdiction of that committee.

Mr. JARMAN. In doing so you are saying we must do a certain thing.

Mr. RABAUT. No; we say the thing should be studied and the Committee on Printing has indicated its intention to study the problem.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman agrees with me in this, though, that had this cut not occurred, and the joint committee as he says has until June 1 to make a decision, as far as the saving is concerned it would not make a particle of difference?

Mr. RABAUT. There would be a difference in the position of the Committee on Appropriations in ignoring a saving which it has twice been invited to effect and the committee is cognizant of that.

Mr. JARMAN. The committee is interested in its position?

Mr. RABAUT. The committee is aware of the position in which it finds itself.

Mr. JARMAN. That goes along with something I said in the committee meeting the other day.

I must hurry along because I know the gentleman has other Members to whom he must yield time. The gentleman's theory apparently is that the first action should be taken by the Committee on Appropriations, in direct contrast with the law. My theory is that the action should be first taken by the Committee on Printing. In line with this, I understand that considerable investigation has occurred.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. In line with that thought considerable investigation has occurred. The House physician was requested to get expert testimony from the Army and Navy, and reported to the chairman of the committee on the floor here yesterday afternoon. I take it that it is the duty of the Joint Committee on Printing to make such an investigation and to have whatever hearing is necessary. It is not the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to do that. I may be entirely wrong about this matter; I do not know, but I believe I can understand the English language. I believe I can understand the law I have read to you. I believe it means just what it states. I believe I can understand that telegram.

In addition, let me say that someone has suggested to me that before final action occurs on this matter I discuss the question with a very venerable and unanimously beloved Member of this House on that side, who, as I understand, is probably still in the newspaper business, or has been, the very able and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE]. I have had no opportunity to do that. A suggestion was made by someone else that the matter be discussed with Senator BORAH, Senator NORRIS, and gentlemen of that type. I wish to say to the committee that I have not, and I hope I never shall, reach the stage of my life when I regard everything old and venerable as obsolete and to be disregarded and kicked out. I never have and I hope I never shall reach the stage when I shall wave aside the opinions of gentlemen like the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentleman referred to in this telegram, and the able gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol.

I wish to call attention to exhibit No. 2, the second proposal, which appeared Saturday morning, and to the fact that apparently a third proposal appeared on the floor this morning.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. May I say to the gentleman I am not a member of this subcommittee, but I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe there is a member of the full Committee on Appropriations who does not recognize the right of the Joint Committee on Printing to determine the form of the RECORD.

Mr. JARMAN. I am glad to have that information.

I cannot yield further to the gentleman unless I am given more time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ENGEL. While I do not wish to disclose anything particularly that happened in committee, I may say that I asked in committee whether, if the Joint Committee on Printing did not approve this new format, we could bring in a deficiency appropriation for the Government Printing Office, and they said "yes." It had not occurred to me that if the RECORD was changed the saving might be made by having the money go back into the Treasury. I just do not want the gentleman to feel that the Committee on Appropriations is trying to take away any rights that belong to his committee or any other committee.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONNERY. Will not the gentleman from Michigan agree that this subcommittee has been presumptuous in the method it has used in presenting this matter to the House? Would it not have been much better if the subcommittee had waited for the Joint Committee on Printing to submit this proposition after giving it thorough examination?

Mr. ENGEL. I was not here when the discussion occurred between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN]. I do believe the saving should be effected, but it should be effected only if and when the Committee on Printing has acted on the proposal. If we wish to let it go as it is, there is no question but that the Public Printer will have to continue the printing of the RECORD as it is now being printed until authorized to change it by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. JARMAN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. ENGEL. There is no question about that at all. If the Joint Committee on Printing does not act, or refuses to act, or refuses to make the change—

Mr. JARMAN. Or decides it is not advisable to act, may I add?

Mr. ENGEL. Absolutely; that is up to you.

Mr. JARMAN. Give us the discretion. It is ours.

Mr. ENGEL. Surely. Then the Committee on Appropriations will have to, and undoubtedly will, come back with a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. JARMAN. Is there any difference as far as the money is concerned how the matter is handled, whether one way or the other?

Mr. ENGEL. If the change is made, the saving will be effected and the money will go back to the Treasury.

Mr. JARMAN. I know; but if the Committee on Appropriations had not seen fit to make this reduction and the Joint Committee on Printing should decide that one of these three formats is preferable and put it into effect before July 1, would not the Government be financially in the same shape as it is in now?

Mr. ENGEL. The excess appropriation would revert to the Treasury.

Mr. JARMAN. Exactly. That is what I pleaded with this subcommittee to do. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman, and I am pleased to hear his statement about the Committee on Appropriations not wanting to usurp the authority of my committee, because, frankly, I think the testimony indicates a contrary attitude. I know the gentleman did not entertain that attitude.

Mr. ENGEL. I am not speaking for the full committee.

Mr. JARMAN. I am speaking for the Committee on Printing, which is a small one, it is true, but the question is important.

In conclusion, I wish to discuss just two more points. As I said, there is no one who realizes more strongly than I do the importance of the great Committee on Appropriations of this House. I know it is one of the most important committees of the House. I do not feel that it is the only committee, however; there are 46 other standing committees in the House. I believe the question is fundamental as to whether the House is going to be permitted to function in the normal, legal, regular way through these 47 committees, not just the largest ones, or whether the power of the small committees is going to be



usurped by the larger ones, in which case we may just as well disband the smaller committees. I think this question is fundamental.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. As I started to say when I was last interrupted, whenever the time arrives that I feel the advice of such venerable gentlemen as Mr. LUCE, Senator BORAH, and the other people I have mentioned should be blandly waved aside just simply for one committee to accomplish something and make a name—whenever that time arrives, Mr. Chairman, I expect to turn in my commission to the people of the great Sixth District of Alabama, because I do not think I should continue to represent them here; and as for me, let us assume that one of these three formats is fine, indeed; let us assume that the change would be the best action ever taken by this House; let us assume that these venerable gentlemen can read it much better; let us assume it would be better on their eyes, I say to you that if 10 Members of that stripe feel that what has been to them for all these years their second Bible is being changed in such a way that it will deteriorate for them and be more difficult for them to read, I say to you gentlemen that even if they are entirely mistaken, even if it would be much preferable for them, I do not consider the saving—and no one is more anxious to save \$125,000 than I am—but I would not consider the saving as worth while at the expense of dissatisfaction and unhappiness on the part of 10 such gentlemen in this House and on the other side, and I say to you that the Joint Committee on Printing should have an opportunity to go into that matter and see whether that is correct or not.

You have been very generous and I thank you very much and I thank both of the gentlemen for their generosity in yielding me time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, 9 days have elapsed since the President of the United States requested an additional \$150,000,000 for the Works Progress Administration, and only 43 days remain before the ax will fall on approximately 2,000,000 people who are now on W. P. A.

Yesterday I obtained special permission to address the House and I asked the question, "What is the Committee on Appropriations doing on this matter? Why is it that the Committee on Appropriations is not meeting on this matter, a matter which is so vital, not only to the unemployed of this country who are on W. P. A., but a matter which is so vital to the entire Nation itself?"

I do not believe there is any alibi or any excuse that can be properly advanced for any delay in this matter. There can be no real excuse for the committee not acting on it at once. This matter is of an emergency nature. It was presented to this House on February 7 by the President in an emergency message under the authority given him by Congress when we passed the W. P. A. deficiency bill.

There can be no question in anyone's mind as to the emergency character of the entire W. P. A. situation and the need for action without delay, for action at once. I think it is only proper that at this time I read the language contained in the President's message, to emphasize that he requested action at once without any delay.

The President said:

Therefore on a program of gradual reduction, from 1,500,000 persons to 2,000,000 would be thrown out of Works Progress Administration employment; or, with the addition of those dependent on them, from 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 Americans would no longer receive Federal Government aid.

Now, get this:

I ask that the Congress commence immediate consideration of these simple and alarming facts.

The English contained in this language is mighty clear. The President did not say that the committee should meet in March or the end of March, the President asked for immediate consideration and immediate means now and not tomorrow or a month from now.

The President also added:

The operations of the Works Progress Administration are of such magnitude that if a reduction such as I have above described has to be carried out, orderly and efficient planning requires that this be known definitely by the first week in March. It is equally important that the executive branch of the Government be informed at the earliest possible moment what additional funds, if any, will be available on and after April 1.

It is likewise important that the country and the unemployed be informed at the earliest possible moment.

The President asks specifically for consideration before the 1st of March and he states that the executive branch of the Government should know where it stands before the 1st of March, and then the President states as follows, and I call the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to this particular section of the President's message:

That the need for orderly planning of the Works Progress Administration program requires that the Administrator should know by the early part of March what funds will be at his disposal after April 1 and that, due to the time required for congressional action, this can be brought about only by my reporting to the Congress on the situation at this time.

I therefore recommend to the Congress immediate consideration of legislation providing an additional sum of \$150,000,000 for the Works Progress Administration to be available in the balance of the current fiscal year.

I realize that perhaps I may be a lone voice crying in the wilderness, as I am crying out here day in and day out in behalf of immediate consideration of this additional appropriation.

It is my intention to daily call to the attention of the country and to the Congress the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is not giving immediate consideration to this emergency and that it is not giving immediate consideration to the President's message in which he asked for immediate consideration. I am not alone in making this demand. I believe that many of the Members of the House join with me in this demand, and I know that I am also speaking for millions and millions of our people throughout the country in making this demand. The W. P. A. issue before the Congress is by no means dead. Nor can you kill it by delay or by the raising of extraneous issues. The American people will not permit you to ignore this problem. This serious emergency will affect 8,000,000 Americans who are dependent upon W. P. A. It will affect every business and industry in the country. If you are opposed to W. P. A., vote against it; but let the Congress have an opportunity to adequately debate the issue and let the country have an opportunity to send its representatives before the committee and let these representatives from all fields of American life be heard, so that the vast damage to the welfare of the Nation, caused by the cut in W. P. A. appropriations, can be understood by Congress. Mr. Chairman, I demand action; a majority of the American people demand action. Any stalling at this time is not fair, and it is hitting below the belt the millions of people directly or indirectly to be injured by the cut Congress made in the appropriations. I appeal to the Members of the House who believe in adequate appropriations for the W. P. A. to join with me every single day in this one-man war which I have started to force the Committee on Appropriations to give the message by the President of the United States the immediate attention it requests, to give the welfare of the unemployed and the welfare of this Nation immediate consideration.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman want to tell us that he is the only representative of the President in advocating the President's policies?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have given no such impression. I do not speak for the President. The President has spoken for himself and the country on this question, and he has done a swell job. By the way, does the gentleman speak for the Republican Party?

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Very well; and I am speaking my own convictions on the matter as well as those of millions of others who feel the same as I do about this issue.

Mr. MICHENER. But the gentleman has stated that he is making a one-man fight.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I said that I have started a one-man war, and I am asking the other Members of the House who want the additional \$150,000,000 appropriated for W. P. A. to join with me in daily demanding that the Committee on Appropriations act at once. I think that is quite clear. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the great State of Illinois honored itself and paid proper tribute to the womanhood of the world when it placed in Statuary Hall, the Westminster Abbey of the United States, a statue of Frances E. Willard, "Our White Ladye," as she is called. As one who has a high regard for the womanhood of America and a deep respect for the position that woman holds in the present scheme of things, I rise to pay tribute in this centennial year of Frances E. Willard's birth to that great woman from the State of Illinois. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, Frances E. Willard has long held the honor of being the sole representative of the women of America in the Hall of Fame at the National Capitol. That indeed is a singular honor but one for which Miss Willard had every qualification.

In 1864 the Congress of the United States authorized the establishment of the now famous gallery known as Statuary Hall in the old Chamber of the House of Representatives, and provided that the several States were at liberty to place there fitting statues of two of their respective immortals. A whole galaxy of these statues was soon presented by the States. They stand lifelike and real, though of heroic size. It was not until 1899, however, after the short but undeniably inspiring life of Frances E. Willard had ended, that the State of Illinois made a move to fill its second place in the Hall with a white marble statue of "Our White Ladye." The resolution of the State legislature, in authorizing this, spared no words in praise of Miss Willard; indeed it lauded her as being "illustrious for historic renown and distinguished for civic service in Europe and America, in a new, unexplored field of Christian endeavor, the effect of whose efforts and achievements and the influence of whose spotless life and sublime example have been so marked that the world has wondered and admired the author, the organizer, and advocate of purity and temperance, Illinois' most illustrious deceased citizen." The same resolution proudly boasted that the purpose of this unusual honor to the memory of a woman was twofold: The first of course, to immortalize Frances E. Willard herself, and the second, to "show to all nations how exalted a sphere woman occupies in the great State of Illinois."

Mr. Chairman, this year, 1939, is the centennial year of Frances E. Willard's birth. The story of her life is too well known to be retold here. It suffices to say that she came of pioneer stock, Puritan stock, with stamina and will and hardy endurance. It is necessary to say too that the Willard family enjoyed an unusually beautiful home-life, enriched by devotion to ideals and heightened by intellectual curiosity. Frances Willard was ever inspired by this memory of her youth. It gave her the basic principles upon which she builded her career, the foundation for her successful life. Long after, in speaking of the ideal woman, Miss Willard said that the mission of this ideal woman was to "make the whole world homelike." She believed "the true woman will make every place she enters homelike—and she will enter every place in this wide world."

Mr. Chairman, the life of Frances Willard still remains a moving inspiration for womankind and it will ever remain so. She was guided unfailingly along the paths of her three great convictions in life by an ever-increasing spiritual growth, a vivid intellect, and by a singular devotion to duty that compelled her to deny the intrusions of all other interests. She looked upon her convictions as other than human. They were God-given inspirations that commanded her abilities and utilized them for the freeing of woman-kind from the thralldom fostered by past generations. Her greatest conviction was that of temperance. It was a con-

viction that might well be said to have come to her as part of her inheritance. She took it up with a crusading zeal. She welded together the forces that advocated temperance and through the medium of her great organization, the W. C. T. U., she made the country and then the world conscious of the newly found powers of women. She was an excellent organizer and a fine orator. These abilities combined brought the success that marked her incessant travels to almost every city and town in the entire country. She preached her great conviction unceasingly.

Miss Willard lived during that period of great reforms which came as an aftermath to the horrors and discouragement of the Civil War. Everywhere gifted people, men and women, were becoming aware of the problems that are those of civilization, and everywhere they strove with a new energy to vitalize the forces of social reform. Miss Willard soon realized that her chosen doctrine, temperance, would be immeasurably strengthened should the right of suffrage be gained for women. With great daring for that time, she took up the cause of equal suffrage and preached it with amazing success. Her difficulties were great. Women themselves were afraid to touch this subject and looked upon those who advocated it as somewhat bold and even possessed of characteristics unbecoming to women. Miss Willard triumphed over opinion and by her triumph gained strength for the cause. She felt that she could not fail because she was guided by a spiritual conviction that told her, "You are to speak for woman's ballot as a weapon for protection for her home."

The third great conviction was that of the compelling power of God. A study of Miss Willard's career would indicate that this conviction was the underlying cause for her great success. She had infinite faith in Christianity and an abiding faith in the evangelical method of teaching and preaching the Gospel. At one point in her career she allied herself with perhaps the most powerful and compelling of all the evangelical teachers, Dwight L. Moody, and went forth to preach with a fervor that was truly amazing.

It is gratifying to know that by the time of her death in 1898 Frances Willard was recognized both at home and abroad as the great moral force she had proven to be. She was a factor, one of the most important indeed, that had come forth to rekindle a faith in the power of man to do good. At the same time she was a pioneer among women and for them she led the way to new heights of power and influence. She aided them to achieve their rightful place in guiding and assisting the destiny of the human race. Whittier grasped the true meaning of her worth when he wrote:

She knew the power of banded ill,  
But felt that love was stronger still,  
And organized for doing good,  
The world's united womanhood.

Mr. Chairman, the following epitaph written by the American poet, Robert McIntyre, makes a fitting close to any tribute to the life and work of Frances E. Willard:

#### OUR WHITE LADY

So pale she lies, in sweet repose!  
Not whiter lie the winter snows  
On this sad earth. From her cold brow  
Unloose the braided myrtles now,  
And bind the wreath of cypress there.  
Put lilies in her hands and hair;  
Come, gather round her, ye who stand  
"For God, and home, and native land."

Doth thine anointed vision see,  
Brave daughter of democracy,  
How Church and State together bow  
Above thy casket, weeping now?  
They loved thee so, best of our best,  
Thou Miriam of the mighty West,  
Who dauntless led thy deathless band,  
"For God, and home, and native land."

White Ladye, though before thine eyes  
The portals fair of Paradise  
Unfold on thine enraptured view  
The heaven that shone thy white soul through—  
Though high the victor's anthem swells  
Where thou dost walk the asphodels,  
Still shalt thou lead us, still command  
"For God, and home, and native land."



Mr. STEFAN. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, as I stand down here in the Well for the first time before this distinguished body, I fully realize that, traditionally, for a new Member the ratio of listening to speaking should be predominantly on the side of the business of listening, and I conform to that policy, because I believe that in a body like this the observations of experience are probably more valuable than the observations of enthusiasm.

But I am also mindful this afternoon of another somewhat axiomatic statement, to the effect that self-preservation is the first law of nature. Consequently, I believe you will agree with me that when anything or anybody seeks to destroy or to tear down a man's home or his homeland, his right of self-preservation becomes paramount and overcomes some of the other man-made axioms. Since this has recently happened to me, I am shunting aside this afternoon the important tradition of silence, to replace it with the tradition of defense and take leave on this busy day to register my protest.

It is in connection with another axiomatic statement that I desire to talk with you. You have all seen among your copybook maxims the old statement saying that "Seeing is believing," but today I point out to you that seeing is not necessarily believing; that it is sometimes highly deceptive and highly deceiving, and I choose to talk on the theme that seeing is deceiving, because of a Government film which I recently saw with my own eyes. I refer to the film entitled "The Plow That Broke the Plains." This talk is intended as a refutation and a rejoinder to that malicious and slanderous attempt to misrepresent the homeland of millions of thrifty people living west of the Mississippi River.

**"THE PLOW THAT BROKE THE PLAINS"**

The immediate reason that I asked leave to talk to you today is that a short time ago I was asked over to Maryland to address the Izaak Walton League. Being interested in the work of conservation I went over, thinking I would enjoy an evening with my fellow conservationists. I must confess that the evening was sadly marred for me when the chairman announced the fact that they were going to show a film that night depicting the general territory from which the speaker came, and then turned loose upon that innocent audience this film, "The Plow that Broke the Plains"—a film which proudly displays the subtitle, "A documentary film of the United States Government."

Early in the picture a map is displayed, flashing across the screen showing three-quarters of my home State of South Dakota, and the major portions of the States of Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. During the entire presentation of this sound motion picture a mournful voice accompanies the scenes which are displayed, and this voice says substantially this:

This is the area of great drought. This is the region of loose soils and high winds. This is the section of no rivers, no trees, and no lakes. This is the story of how a people have ruined the great cattle country and made it a wasted wilderness of disappointment, despair, and distress.

I am willing to admit that during the past 6 years South Dakota and these other States have experienced their share of distress; that we have had drought and grasshoppers; but what section of the United States has not, during the past 6 years, had its share of distress, and by what rhyme or reason is the money of the taxpayers used to concoct a motion-picture show to present to the world at large just the disagreeable and unfortunate aspects of the homeland of some 30,000,000 people?

While my section has had its fight with loose soil and high winds, there have been insect plagues in Dixie; there have been floods in Ohio; we have heard much of hurricanes in New England, earthquakes in California, and typhoons in Florida. We have heard of distress here, there, and elsewhere, but where would there be any justice in having our Government use our money to take a picture just showing this distress?

What would you think, for example, if your Government were to take pictures showing the monotonous white steps of the tenement region of Baltimore and say, "This is the background for the song, 'Maryland, My Maryland'?" Or if it were to show the havoc of the hurricane, and only the havoc of the hurricane, and say to the people of my district, "This is New England"; or if it were to show the people running from an earthquake in California to the accompaniment of the music "California, Here We Come"? Or if it were to point the camera down First Street SW., in Washington, D. C., and tell the people of America, "This is Washington, D. C."? Or if it were to take 100 feet of film showing a man in different positions scratching fleas on the sands of Florida, and say, "This is Florida"? But that is what they have done to South Dakota and the other States mentioned in the map displayed on this film, "The Plow That Broke the Plains."

**NOT EVEN THE PROVERBIAL HAPPY ENDING**

In contrast to this picture they showed one the same night entitled "The River," which tells a sad enough story about the people of the South, and indicates that they have not exerted a very wise intelligence in their relationship to the soil, but which at least shows the improvements they have learned from experience. The end of this story describes the people of the Mississippi Valley, which has been covered by a flood, growing up and building back and expanding; but in "The Plow That Broke the Plains" we are not even given the courtesy of the proverbial happy ending, because from beginning to end it is a drama of distress.

Consequently I have addressed a letter to the governmental agency which, at your expense and mine, is circulating, free of charge, this disgraceful misrepresentation of my homeland, and I shall insert the letter in the RECORD in full, asking them to be kind enough to withdraw this film from circulation. I think that is a fair request. The people of my State do not want it and do not like it. The people of other sections are entitled to the truth and not such a biased presentation of just one aspect of a great territory.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1939.

MR. LOWELL MELLETT,

*Executive Director, National Emergency Council,  
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. MELLETT: The other night while attending a public meeting over in Maryland, I saw, for the first time, the motion picture with sound accompaniment, entitled, "The Plow That Broke the Plains," which I understood was filmed for the Farm Security Administration under the direction of Pare Lorentz. It is my further understanding that this picture is now being distributed, free of charge, to schools and other organizations requesting it from the United States Film Service which operates under the direction of the National Emergency Council of which you are the executive director.

Inasmuch as an early scene in this motion picture portrays a map in which fully three-fourths of my home State of South Dakota is pictured along with major portions of such States as Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, I am extremely distressed that this picture should be exhibited in its present form. While I have no desire to impugn the motives of those originally preparing this picture at public expense, I cannot help but resent the fact that its continued exhibition gives an entirely erroneous and unfairly desolate impression of this great homeland of millions of thrifty and happy people.

I have traveled extensively in every State pictured in this map, and while soil erosion is unquestionably a problem which we must solve in this area, "The Plow That Broke the Plains" creates the impression among those not familiar with this territory that the devastation is far more widespread and hopeless than is actually the case.

Either deliberately or unintentionally, the picture incorrectly implies a complete lack of rivers, lakes, and trees in this area, despite the fact that there are over 1,000 miles of river in South Dakota alone, and it indicates that the territory has become virtually worthless for agricultural purposes. It omits any reference, either by picture or spoken word, to the beautiful Black Hills of my home State, for example; to the 500 new lakes which have been built in South Dakota since 1930; to the many prosperous, comfortable homes which dot the entire area pictured on this map; to the fertile fields and friendly wood lots which cover much of this territory; to the prosperous, modern towns of Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, Nebraska, and all the other States described by the narrator of the picture; to the splendid progress being made in controlling this soil erosion; to the successful experience enjoyed in the raising of new trees through the shelterbelt program; and to a host of other

benefits and advantages which are typical of this great area, and which should be included in the picture if it is to give an impartial and honest impression to its audience.

Therefore, because the circulation of this picture so unfairly labels a great section of our country as a territory of lost hope and exhausted opportunities I respectfully request that you immediately announce an executive order withdrawing this picture from circulation and discontinuing all further exhibitions of "The Plow That Broke the Plains."

I have discussed this matter with a number of other Congressmen from the States covered by this picture, and I find them in complete agreement with me in this request. If necessary, I can have others join me in this appeal; but I feel you will readily see the justice of my position and gladly comply with its provisions. The continued exhibition of this picture cannot be considered as anything less than a direct affront to the fine American citizens who are enjoying this area as their homeland and who are constantly working to make it a happier and a more attractive place in which to live. I shall appreciate a letter from you conveying your consideration of this request.

Sincerely yours,

KARL MUNDT,

*Member Congress, First District, South Dakota.*

P. S.—Since dictating this letter I am in receipt of notice that the South Dakota Editorial Association at its annual midwinter meeting last week adopted a resolution asking that "The Plow That Broke the Plains" be withdrawn from circulation. So you see that it is apparent that among the people most affected by this picture its continued showing is highly unpopular and offensive.

K. M.

I hope and I expect that after this matter has been brought to the attention of the proper authorities, this picture will be withdrawn or modified and revised to show the complete story, showing the improvement which has taken place in the last few years, together with the many natural advantages and opportunities of this area. If so, I will feel that my efforts have been richly rewarded. If not so, I must continue the fight with whatever resources are at my command, because it is grossly unfair and unjust to so condemn a section of the country, and I shall continue to fight until successful, for the benefit of the fair name of my State and a fair deal for this region of the Middle West.

#### MOSQUITO CONTROL IN A "DESERT"

It may be there are some of you who feel that this film presents a true picture of this section of the country. If so let me point out that this is not even the attitude of the Government which took the film at your expense and which circulated it through the department known as the United States Film Service at your expense, because while the picture was being circulated another Government department sent its agents out into my State which they picture on the map as a land of no lakes, no rivers, and no trees, and sought to establish in the capital city of Pierre a mosquito-control board to eliminate mosquitoes from the swamps to save the natives from malaria. [Laughter.] Consequently there must have been a fallacy in the picture which describes this land as a second cousin to the Sahara Desert without even giving us the courtesy of putting an oasis in the desert or admitting that a camel could live there.

Mr. Chairman, this year the United States plays host to the people of the world by staging two mammoth expositions, one the New York World's Fair, the other the Golden Gate Exposition, of which we have heard something this afternoon. South Dakota is on the main line of travel between these two great expositions. The citizens of my State are eager to point out to the tourists from throughout America the fact that the statements and the conditions presented in this film are false.

We invite you to visit this region, but we do not want a sign nailed up at the border of South Dakota stating, "Out where the worst begins! South Dakota, a land of disappointment, disaster, and dust! Pray you, avoid it."

And we do not want our money being spent by our Government, from taxes which we pay, promoting a motion picture carrying such a fictitious message to the people of America. We want at least to have the right and the privilege other people have to work out our own problems and to solve the distressful situations which have engulfed us in part as they have reached around to touch the people of all other sections of the country.

#### GOVERNMENT URGES PEOPLE TO SEE FILM

This enterprising department of the Government is not content merely to let the people who request it enjoy the free distribution of this picture but it has become so energetic that it is now sending out circulars advertising the fact that the film is available. So South Dakota and the other States represented not only have to fight a free motion-picture show but the whole Government propaganda machine putting out literature of this kind to induce people to get this picture which is called a documentary film and, consequently, by the uninitiated and the unknowing believed to be typical of this section of the country. Let me read you a passage from a paragraph here in this advertising folder:

A saga of the Great Plains area of the United States. This film of American history surveys the various movements in the Great Plains area, the passing of the buffalo, the successive invasions of the range cattle, the homesteader, and the large-scale farmer. Tremendous, too, are the disastrous dust storms which whip across once fertile areas.

Notice the past tense implication—once fertile areas.

Carrying away rich topsoil and bringing tragedy to the Great Plains.

#### A DRAMA OF DELUSION

Here are Government documents themselves trying to bring distress to my section of the country. This great drama of delusion to which we are compelled to pay portions of our tax money is the most disgraceful attempt of which I know anything about to misrepresent the environment of the homeland of a large section of happy, prosperous, patriotic Americans. It happens that I have traveled and spoken in all of the States represented by the map at the beginning of this picture. I know the spirit of the people there, I know the topography of the ground. I have fished in the inland lakes in Texas on the very spot this map shows as being nothing but a sea of shifting sand. I have seen the broad streets of the modern cities of Oklahoma which this picture also includes in this land of distress and disaster. I have watched with amazement the productivity of the fields rich in harvest in Nebraska and in Kansas, in South Dakota and in North Dakota. I have seen the great grazing territories of Wyoming and Montana. I have caught trout in the silvery streams of Colorado—all in the section which this film depicts as a modern American desert! I know from personal observation that the people are not the short-sighted soil wreckers and crude ground hogs described by this infamous picture.

If at any time our folks have had to farm too hard or too much, it is not because they were trying to get rich quick; it was not because they were more avaricious than the average man; it was simply because they had to compete against occasional short crops, added to the perpetually unfair prices paid for the products of the agricultural section of America.

I may say to you candidly and honestly, with simple midwestern frankness, that despite the destructive aspects of this film, I believe the great area pictured therein, even today, has the greatest degree of man-acre opportunity available in the Western Hemisphere. No overcrowded sections of population there. No restrictions making it important that a man shall have a big private capital before he may go into business. No sit-down strikes. No wars between classes and groups. Just a thrifty, forward-looking people trying to improve what is already a splendid and verdant homeland.

#### STILL OPPORTUNITY ALONG THE OREGON TRAIL

Mr. Chairman, there is still wealth in the West. There is still opportunity along the Oregon Trail. The new wealth produced in the area pictured by this film as being a land of lost hope, is the new wealth, I submit, that is turning the wheels of the factories of America today. It is giving employment to the people in the large cities of this land. The tonnage hauled from that great producing area has kept the railroad business from collapsing entirely. Our farmers who have fought these short crops, caused by occasional lack of moisture; our farmers who find themselves today the only great occupational group for whom the Government has



established no definite price legislation, now find themselves subjected to this offensive criticism, by the unique activity of their own Government attempting to discredit and disparage the country in which they live.

By trying to keep tourists from visiting it, trying to discourage people from the surrounding country buying from the people within this area, pointing the finger of condemnation, scorn and contempt at a group of people whose activities have largely kept America from complete economic collapse, the Government is handicapping this section.

NO PRICE AND NOW NO PRAISE FOR THE FARMERS

Look at the rest of the record. Where do we find price-fixing legislation today? We find it for labor. We find it for business. We find it for railroads. But not for these farmers who fight inclement weather at times, and who are now fighting this new hazard; these farmers who are trying to do their best to supply the foodstuffs of America, with the catch-as-catch-can prices they have to accept in the open market. Instead of being encouraged for their efforts, they find themselves subjected to this tirade of scorn.

COME OUT AND SEE FOR YOURSELVES

Mr. Chairman, and all America, on behalf of my native State of South Dakota I invite you to visit us next summer. I invite you to come and see with your own eyes why I condemn the film "The Plow That Broke the Plains" as the most dastardly, and disgraceful attempt to besmirch a fair section of the country that has ever been conceived by any nation anywhere. I want you to see the more than 1,000 miles of rivers in the State of South Dakota alone, which brands certainly as an untruth that melancholy voice that says "it is a land of no lakes, no trees, and no rivers."

I want you to come and fish and swim in the more than 1,000 lakes we have in the State of South Dakota today. I want you to visit the more than a million acres of native forest land in the State of South Dakota, and to sit in the shade of the hundreds and thousands of other little wooded lots, planted by the ambition and the vision of the farmers who are not deserting their homes, as indicated by this picture, but are trying to improve them and pass them on to their children in an enhanced and improved state.

I want you to see the fertile fields of my home State of South Dakota on which today is raised some of the richest spring wheat to be found in the country, on which we raise some of the best potatoes, the best barley for malt purposes, and the finest flax, corn, and alfalfa that you can find in America.

THE FIGHT WILL GO ON IF IT MUST

I want you to check with your own eyes the statements I have made from the standpoint of the fact that this region is the opposite to what it has been pictured in this film, the withdrawal of which today I am respectfully requesting, and the withdrawal of which I shall continue to insist upon until either the National Emergency Council or this young man from South Dakota comes out on top. The fight is going on because I believe the cause is right and just.

May I call attention to the fact that the annual farm production of South Dakota today is equal to the production of Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts combined. May I call your attention to the fact that this year, while they are showing this picture representing our State as a vast area of dust, the national corn-husking contest of America was held on one of the fine cornfields of my home State of South Dakota.

I want you to come out and check for yourself the accuracy of what I am stating here this afternoon and then to realize with me the humiliation I must suffer, visiting in Maryland or some place nearby and having people watch this film, believing it to be typical of that section of America from Canada to the Gulf, but which is fortunate enough to lie west of the Mississippi River.

I want you to visit the beautiful Black Hills. I want you to see the site that Calvin Coolidge chose for his summer White House. I want you to see the Rushmore Monument on which the sculptor is carving the most colossal statues

to be found in Christendom. I want you to watch the deer and elk play out in the hills. I want you to enjoy hunting ringneck pheasants in the best pheasant territory in the Nation, a country in which the pheasants are almost as thick as mosquitoes in a Jersey swamp!

I want you to see the gold mines of the Black Hills, because there you will see the richest 100 square miles of land to be found anywhere. I want you to visit this busy, friendly, happy State. The United States News for February 13 pictured a map of the United States telling the true story of the West. It shows that South Dakota which just a few years ago had the greatest per capita wealth in America is again on the way back to national leadership.

Here we have South Dakota on the map with a red line around the State. There is no red ink in the State and less red doctrine there than you can find in any other State in America. [Applause.] You will find there are seven States in America which in 1939 have better than the average national recovery, and among the States is South Dakota, not a land of dust and doubt but a land of prosperity and opportunity. [Applause.]

Now I thank you very much for letting me come down here this afternoon and express myself in defense of my State. I do want you to agree with me that with respect to this film, "Seeing is deceiving." I want you to come out and visit us and see for yourselves the rectitude of my position when I humbly ask that this Government agency withdraw "The Plow That Broke the Plains" from circulation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to add to my colleague's remarks the fact that he has support for his position from home. I received just now a letter signed by Mr. John H. Craig, secretary of the South Dakota Press Association. The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1939.

HON. FRANCIS CASE,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: The people of South Dakota feel the State is being done an injustice by the showing of the moving picture "The Plow That Broke the Plains." The South Dakota Press Association passed a resolution at its winter convention on Saturday in Huron asking the Senators and Representatives from this State to use their influence in having the film put out of circulation.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman. The letter is very fine.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No doubt the gentleman will receive from the director of the bureau handling this film an answer to the gentleman's protest. Am I correct in assuming that the gentleman intends to ask unanimous consent to place that answer in the RECORD so the other side of this question will be given to the Members of Congress and the public generally?

Mr. MUNDT. If he withdraws the film I shall be pleased to put it in the RECORD. If he intends to keep on showing this film he will have to handle his side of the fight from his end.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, if the director answers the gentleman's protest the gentleman will not put that answer in the RECORD, so the Members of Congress can see the subject from his viewpoint and the viewpoint of those who are responsible for the film?

Mr. MUNDT. I have lived in the West all my life and I know that what I have said is correct. If he will answer me according to the rules of correctness and withdraw his film I certainly will be glad to put the answer in the RECORD. If he proposes to defend the policy of trying to bring disgrace to my homeland I will object to having it put in the RECORD, instead of putting it in myself. [Applause.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman feel that the film has already had circulation and has been speaking for itself in defamation of the State of South Dakota?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; this film has been in circulation and playing for 2 years now. We have made protests in other manners and now we are going to try to appeal to the justice of the Members of Congress, so if we must we can bring pressure to bear to withdraw that film from circulation. I have no desire to impugn the motives—although they would be easier to impugn than to interpret—of the man who made the film. I am objecting to the film because of the reaction of the people who have never seen the area.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the gentleman I have seen that beautiful State of his, and I know the gentleman speaks the truth. Also, when I was in Hot Springs, I was informed the people there did not lock their front doors at night, because the community was so honest.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman believe it is quite fair for him to present his side of this subject and have it spread in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then not permit the other side to present its viewpoint and place it in the RECORD?

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentleman can see how obvious an answer there is to that. Does the gentleman believe it is fair for the National Government for 2 years to spread its side of the story on the screens of America and never give us a chance to tell the truth? [Applause.]

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman will permit, I may say I believe this film can be doing a great deal of good to the State of South Dakota and that it will make the people conscious of the fact that it is necessary for this Government to spend a good deal of money in such sections of the country in order to rehabilitate them. For that reason I believe the film is doing the State of South Dakota some good in that respect. It is only fair for the gentleman to put the answer of the Director in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. If the conditions were as dry in our State as they appear in the picture, which they are not, it would be quite as unnecessary to show this picture there as hanging a thermometer in Alaska to tell the Eskimos it is cold. You could not do any good any place else by displaying this picture.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I suggest that the people of South Dakota would be perfectly willing to have them place the other side of the story in the RECORD if the administration will also give us a film so we can answer the film that has already been in circulation.

Mr. MUNDT. Splendid; that is exactly right and you would assume that would be fair, would you not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I did not hear the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. We as taxpayers have a lot of money invested in this film that is doing us harm and my colleague from South Dakota suggests that if they will print a film showing the advantageous side of South Dakota we will be glad to give them an opportunity to present their case on the floor here.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The subject the gentleman had before the House was this particular film "The Plow That Broke the Plains." I think we ought at least to give the administration or whoever is responsible for this film an opportunity to present their reasons to the Members of

Congress and the people of the United States generally for showing this film in this manner.

Mr. MUNDT. They have been showing their film for 2 years. The period of refutation has just begun. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to read into the RECORD a short editorial from the Boston Sunday Post of January 8, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, on Friday night, February 17, in the fine city of Woburn, Mass., in my congressional district, the people will gather for a ceremony to unveil a bronze plaque to the memory of a man who has done much for the advancement of our country and whose invention has meant employment for thousands of our citizens. I refer to Charles Goodyear, the discoverer of the vulcanization of rubber.

This being the one hundredth anniversary of his discovery, it is particularly fitting that notice of it should be taken in Woburn, for it was here that his experiments were made and perfected. The plaque I mentioned is being placed in the social hall of the Goodyear School in East Woburn.

On the floor of the House I want to pay my tribute to Charles Goodyear, who, through all kinds of adversity and hardship, illness, poverty, disappointments, struggled on through the years of tireless work until he reached his goal and a glorious success. What an example he sets for the present generation. What an inspiration to us all. He typifies all that is fine in the New England character.

Charles Goodyear, who was to rise from relentless adversity and debtors' prison into high service of his fellow man, was born in New Haven, Conn., December 29, 1800. His father, Amasa Goodyear, was a practical-minded Yankee manufacturer credited with many inventions.

When the boy was 7 the family moved to nearby Naugatuck. There his father started a factory for the manufacture of some of his inventions, which included the first closed lamp for burning oil and an improved spring-steel hay fork.

Young Charles was a quiet, serious boy who showed little aptitude for things mechanical. Of a religious turn of mind, he joined the church at 16 and hoped to become a minister. His father needed his help, however, and for a while he worked in the factory.

Later he went to Philadelphia and apprenticed himself to learn the hardware trade. Upon reaching his majority he came back to Naugatuck to become associated with his father.

In 1824 he married his childhood sweetheart, Clarissa Beecher. Two years later they moved to Philadelphia, where Charles opened a hardware store, selling principally his father's products.

For a time the business, said to have been the first retail hardware concern in the United States, was successful. Then young Goodyear, never physically strong, was taken sick. During 2 years of ill health his business declined.

Then several of his creditors failed. In a valiant effort to meet his obligations, to keep his business going, and to provide for his loyal wife and their child he began selling his patents.

His courageous efforts were unavailing. He lost his store and suffered the humiliation of confinement in a debtors' cell. Released, he turned to inventions of his own in an effort to clear up his debts and regain his feet.

A "safe-eye" button, spring-lever faucets, an improved air pump, and a boat constructed of metal tubes helped him get a new start. It was while he was working on a washer for his spring-lever faucet in 1832 that he became interested in rubber.

Charles Goodyear was 20 years old when American traders began bringing back from Brazil some of the cumbersome



rubber shoes made by natives of the Para jungle. These were turned out from clay models over which the Indians poured the milk, or latex, of the rubber trees.

Manufacturers in this country and in England were keenly interested in making in their own factories these shoes, which they called gum elastic, as well as other products of rubber.

But this early rubber, when spread on cloth, would melt and run in summer, grow brittle and crack in winter. Garters and suspenders containing rubber threads had to be kept away from a stove or fireplace.

The fate of an industry, destined to become one of the world's largest and most important, was here to be determined.

It was in 1832, while Charles Goodyear was struggling for a foothold, that he stepped into the store of E. M. Chaffee, in Roxbury, Mass., to buy a life preserver for one of the metal-tube boats on which he was working.

Chaffee had been experimenting with the manufacture of patent-leather shoes, which he made by dissolving rubber in turpentine, adding lampblack for color, and spreading over cloth. His innovations seemed to be going well, and he expanded into making rubberized clothing, caps, and life preservers.

Goodyear saw these products in Chaffee's store. But his interest at the time was not on rubber but on inventions which would produce ready cash. His quick mind saw an improvement which he could make in an inflation tube, and he forthwith sold the idea to Chaffee.

It was a year later that Goodyear returned to the Roxbury store with other ideas which he hoped to sell. He found the merchant in distress. Some \$20,000 worth of his rubber goods had decomposed in the summer heat. To keep word of this from spreading, Chaffee had to haul the goods stealthily out of his store under cover of night, and secretly bury them.

Now, at this fateful moment Goodyear's interest was definitely aroused. It was motivated partly, no doubt, by his friend's ruin, but principally because here was a challenging problem.

Once started he was never to cease until success rewarded his doggedness, his sacrifices, his genius, and abounding faith. The road was to lead through extreme poverty, discouragement, imprisonment, and almost every loss that a man may suffer.

Even while Goodyear was conducting his endless and apparently fruitless experiment, the bottom fell out of the American rubber trade. Friends and relatives begged him to drop the work which now seemed indubitably foredoomed to failure.

Refusing, he labored on without flagging, the faith firmly fixed in his mind that there must be some method by which rubber could be treated to make it permanently usable, to keep it from melting in heat, cracking in cold.

Contemporary annals enable us to pick up his unhappy trail in New Haven in 1835. He was trying desperately to hit upon a way to remove the stickiness from his rubber.

In an interlude of financial despair he sold his furniture—even to the linens spun by the toiling hands of his wife. He left his family in a New Haven boarding house and set out for New York, determined to find money to continue his work.

In a dingy, barren, little room, three flights up, in a crooked street in Greenwich Village, his brother-in-law, William De Forrest, was to find him, surrounded by a jumble of kettles, white lead, rubber, and shellac.

He was now trying quicklime and boiling water. At last he seemed to have achieved a rubber cloth with a dry, non-adhesive surface. Taking one of his wife's old silk petticoats, he rubberized it and cut the cloth up into several sample rain hats.

These appeared to be capable of resisting heat as well as rain, and once again Goodyear envisioned success. He made up rubber sheets, and various articles of clothing, wearing the latter about the streets of New York to prove

their practicability. A visitor who sought him was told by one of his scornful neighbors:

If you meet a fellow wearing a rubber cap, rubber stock, coat, vest, and shoes, and with a rubber money purse without a cent in it—that will be Goodyear.

He sent some of his products to the Mechanics Institute and received a silver medal, his first award. Just as he was preparing himself for a long overdue measure of acclaim, it was discovered that acid dropped on the sheets neutralized the lime and made them again sticky and unusable.

One eventful day he discovered that a nitric acid treatment apparently would enable his rubber to resist heat. In an outburst of exuberance he made up rubberized cloth bandages, rubberized articles of wearing apparel, rubberized paper on which he wrote a glowing letter to President Andrew Jackson.

A partner came to him with money. They took over an abandoned rubber factory on Staten Island and went into the manufacture of rubber shoes, rubberized clothing, life preservers. He sent for his family to join him.

Then came the panic of 1837. The partner and financial backer went broke; the Goodyears lost everything they had. But the brave little family rallied. While Goodyear went fishing for food for the table, his wife and children took to making rubberized aprons and piano covers by hand and selling them for the bare necessities. Mrs. Goodyear made and sold bonnets of pasteboard.

There was the bitter day when, there being nothing else of intrinsic value in the house, Goodyear set out penniless for New York to pawn the last of the family's silver spoons. To pay for his fare across on the ferry he had to give his umbrella to one of the guards.

But further backing was not to be found. Setting out for Boston he looked up Chaffee again, and got the use of that despairing manufacturer's idle rubber machinery. Still confident of his acid-gas method of treating rubber, Goodyear resumed his experiments and turned to making shoes.

This went well, and soon he was able to sell his patent rights to a Providence company which successfully operated under them for many years.

But the urge to improve his rubber to the perfection he dreamed of had not left Goodyear. He sold out completely, realizing some \$5,000 from the disposal of manufacturing licenses, and took his family to Roxbury where the possibilities of still another bankrupt rubber factory had aroused his attention.

He learned that the foreman of the defunct company, Nathaniel Hayward, had attained some success by spreading sulphur on rubber sheeting and drying it in the sun. Goodyear bought his patent and hired Hayward as his foreman.

Goodyear now began an extensive business in the making of life preservers, and took a Government contract for 150 mail bags.

While he was away on a business trip, however, the mail bags decomposed and the life preservers, which had been so confidently shipped out, were returned as worthless. The new method seemed only to have cured the surface.

Having invested everything, Goodyear saw it lost. His furniture was sold under the hammer. He moved his uncomplaining family to Woburn, and settled down to making rubber shoes by hand to provide a bare living.

Now the white frame house beneath the towering elms of Woburn became the focus, the point upon which the story turns.

It was a bitter day early in 1839. While his patient wife was out driving a bargain for food, Goodyear was in the kitchen, eternally compounding and mixing, kneading and rolling his sticky mass of sulphur and rubber. In some manner he dropped a handful of it on top of the hot stove.

Legend says that he dropped it by accident, startled and chagrined when Mrs. Goodyear suddenly returned to find him "experimenting again." Goodyear was to deny in the later years that his discovery was entirely by accident.

Whatever the case was, his alert mind was quick to see what had occurred. To his eager amazement he discovered that the rubber had not melted. It had only charred.

High excitement possessed him. "If the process of charring could be stopped at the right point," his biographer later was to report his reasoning, "it might divest the gum of its native adhesiveness throughout."

He noted that the charred rubber retained its flexibility. Nailing it to the outside of the kitchen door, he let it remain there overnight in subzero temperatures.

Next morning he found that the extreme cold had not affected it.

Now he was sure he was on the right track. But he realized that he must determine the exact degree of heat and period of time necessary to get a perfect cure and smooth surface.

Although, after the heart-breaking years, his dreams seemed about to come true, he forced himself to proceed with extraordinary caution to make test after test.

Day after day, when his wife had finished her baking and left the kitchen free, he made up compounded batches of his rubber and put them in the oven for 1, 2, 3, 6 hours.

He traveled to Lynn and there tried it out in the steam heat of a mill. He tried curing rubber cloth before an open fire by boiling it in his wife's saucepans, by hanging it over a teakettle spout, by roasting it in hot ashes, in hot sand, before a slow fire, before a quick fire.

After hours he haunted the bakeshops of Woburn, importuning the bakers to let him use their ovens. They, as other townspeople, complacently believed the frail little man a harmless lunatic.

At last Goodyear convinced himself he had definitely discovered the process he had so long sought. He named it "vulcanization," for Vulcan, mythological deity of fire.

Unsuccessfully he sought urgent financial aid. He tried contacts and friends in both Boston and New York. They let him know sharply that they were "through with him and his confounded rubber."

The months of 1839 had been dragging on as Goodyear persisted with his tests. He was exhausted and ill and began to be plagued by the fear that he would die before he could carry his work on to the success he was certain awaited.

He sold his library, even his children's schoolbooks, for \$5. His family went into the nearby woods to gather fuel; they ate half-grown potatoes. Still he refused to quit.

Convinced that in a big oven of his own he could carry his tests to the final conclusion, he scraped his last pennies together and built one 6 feet square.

In his loved ones' extremity, he received a letter from France wanting to buy his old nitric-acid process for curing rubber. It was characteristic of the man that he wrote back declining the money, stating he had found a better process and would write again when his tests were completed.

It was at this crucial point that his brother-in-law, De Forrest, sent Goodyear \$50 to come to New York in a final effort to raise capital. There he met William Rider, a merchant, who furnished capital to start a factory in Springfield, Mass., for making the shirred cloth which Goodyear had invented by pressing rubber thread into fabric.

Two years later, in 1842, Rider went bankrupt, and De Forrest became the financial backer of the Springfield factory. Goodyear put his two brothers, Nelson and Henry, in charge of the plant.

Meanwhile he continued subjecting his process of vulcanization to such a series of conclusive tests that at last he was satisfied he had perfected it.

The plant prospered with the manufacture of articles made of Goodyear's new "vulcanized" rubber. Under his direction more and more articles were turned out, and all proved invariably satisfactory.

In 1843 Goodyear filed a formal application for patent on the discovery of vulcanization. The patent was issued to him on June 14, 1844.

The following is an editorial in the Boston Sunday Post of January 8, 1938:

The city of Woburn has achieved coast-to-coast fame in recent months as a place in which municipal economy is being carried out by a forthright and energetic mayor.

But lest the opinion go out that the municipality is noteworthy only for his crusade, the lion's cage, and lighting by moonlight, the residents this month will observe a centenary of one of the greatest scientific discoveries of modern times.

Through this discovery an entire new world of progress has been possible. Without it the automobile and a host of other common-places of modern life would have been impossible.

It was 100 years ago this month that Charles Goodyear, a bankrupt hardware dealer, recently out of jail for nonpayment of his just debts, discovered the process of vulcanizing rubber.

This changed rubber from a puzzling, sticky substance, of little commercial value, to the serviceable commodity it is today. It made possible the myriad inventions which go with the modern age.

It built factories and cities.

It seems strange that Woburn is still a small city with a population in the 20,000's, while the process discovered in a Woburn kitchen in 1839 should have built such places as Akron, Ohio, with a population of nearly 275,000.

Here, Mr. Chairman, I can say why that is possible. It is due to the fact that we pay higher wages in Massachusetts than in other sections of the country.

But it happened. Goodyear was in his poor and almost barren home 100 years ago this month, puttering with rubber in the kitchen.

His wife, who must have been the soul of patience, was out at the greengrocers, trying to make a few pennies buy a meal. For 7 years this strange, persistent man had been struggling with the ill-smelling, hard-to-handle substance.

The hardware business had gone the way of neglected things, and whatever money the Goodyears had was used up in living and paying for the experiments.

On this particular cold morning he was kneading rubber on a marble slab with a rolling pin. His wife burst in through the kitchen door and so startled the absorbed chemist that he dropped some of the rubber on the top of a hot stove. He had mixed the rubber with sulphur, and in a moment he saw that the heat had changed the consistency of the substance.

It was this accident that started him off on the course which led to the vulcanization of rubber. He named the process himself, and through it rubber became the tremendous factor that it is today.

It would be hard indeed to visualize on that frosty morning the vast forests which would be devoted to the production of rubber, the vessels which would bring the crude product to civilization, and the huge factories, employing thousands of hands, which would spring up to make rubber into thousands of forms.

His invention brought him great honor here and abroad. He probably never realized the full import of his process, for the automobile age was yet ahead.

But he brought to Woburn an added fame, a tradition, and a legend.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON].

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Chairman, I would be ungrateful indeed if I did not recognize and appreciate the able discussion by my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I also resent the film that the gentleman spoke about a while ago, because Montana does not deserve a reputation of that sort. Montana is a State of nearly 147,000 square miles, with paved roads throughout the entire State. Montana is a State in which you will find the largest and richest mines in the world, a State that has produced gold and is now producing gold, tin, and also manganese. Manganese is a metal we are importing today from Russia. We have streams in indefinite number and we have one of the largest inland lakes in the world in Montana. The headwaters of the Columbia River and the headwaters of the Mississippi are located in Montana. Montana is also an agricultural State.

So I say, I would be ungrateful indeed did I not refer to the State of Montana, although that is not my main purpose in rising. Montana asks for nothing except the right to work and produce, unmolested by the Federal Government. The greatest handicap we have in Montana is the pernicious influence of the Federal departments, which deliberately misrepresent the State of Montana and the rest of the Western States. I received a resolution today from the Legislature of the State of Montana, which I shall read in part:

Be it resolved, That it is the prayer of your memorialists, the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, that the Congress of the United States should, by proper legislation, right the wrong suffered by these farmers, processors, and wage



earnings engaged in the growing and manufacturing of beet sugar by immediately raising the domestic sugar quota to permit the unrestricted production of sugar within the continental limits of the United States, and to maintain the protective market by quota reductions and adequate tariffs on foreign sugar.

Mr. Chairman, it is well to bear in mind that when a people are asking for their constitutional rights as reserved to them by the Constitution in amendments 9 and 10, public rights are nearly lost. When a people must petition the Government they have nourished for 151 years to give them back the rights which they originally reserved to themselves, something has happened to our Government that is not for the general welfare of the United States.

That, Mr. Chairman, is approximately our position today. When the sugar producers of Montana petition this body to restore their right to produce and supply our own tables with our own production, it is not only for the welfare of the people in my State, but it is for the general good of the people in every State of the Union.

Had this been a special or partisan request, no support would have been given to it by me before this House. However, this involves a problem of magnitude, and is therefore the concern of Congress. It also concerns the welfare of the Nation and must therefore be corrected not only as an aid in our present state of peace but as a greater necessity should trouble overtake us. I shall ask my colleagues to give this serious consideration because it concerns every State in this Union, and it is for the general interest and general welfare of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, just one observation contained in the memorial which I desire to especially emphasize; that is, the higher wages and income of the beet workers and growers over that enjoyed by the sugarcane workers in the offshore areas. I call the attention of the House to the most unusual statement appearing in the Appendix of the Record on page 540. Wages of \$9.72 per day for those working in domestic sugar-beet fields is worthy of our serious attention. Any industry that can pay such high wages on basis of present purchasing power of the dollar is worthy of perpetuation, protection, and expansion. I challenge any other line of agricultural activity to show such excellent returns to the hand laborers. This is a group of workers with purchasing power which far exceeds that of anything we can hope to obtain in the tropical areas. The industry in the offshore areas is not built and operated on such an economy, and in no wise can Cuba show such a fair division of the proceeds with the field workers.

The memorial follows:

#### House Joint Memorial 7

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America requesting it to assist the beet-sugar industry in Montana

Whereas only 29.5 percent of domestic sugar sales are allotted to domestic producers at present, Cuba has practically the same amount, and our insular possessions 41.5 percent, American producers are rightfully entitled to all of the domestic market that they are able to supply; and

Whereas the import quotas of raw sugar as set at the present time have brought the farmers, the workers in the beet-sugar factories, and the laborers in the beet fields in direct competition with the poorly paid labor in the sugar-producing territories outside of continental United States, such competition has the direct result of lowering the standard of living of these farmers and laborers to a level incompatible with the American way of life; and

Whereas sugar beets can be effectively grown at a reasonable profit in this State and there is no food more valuable to the consumer in nutritive worth even at a much higher price than at present; and

Whereas the production of sugar beets provides employment at good wages for many times as many workers as the same acreage of other crops adapted to this latitude and any control of the expansion of sugar-beet acreage means more unemployment and more relief clients who could otherwise make a living in this industry; and

Whereas there is grave danger that the present policy, if continued, will result in many now employed in this country losing their means of livelihood, thereby further increasing the already tremendous burden of unemployment; and

Whereas our beet growers, if permitted to make a reasonable amount of money, are, due to their higher standard of living, many times better customers for eastern industry as are foreign sugar laborers and planters; and

Whereas an orderly and sound expansion of beet plantings in accordance with the development of suitable land and the building of new factories to take care of the increased production is a

reasonable and necessary process to the building up of this State and should be encouraged; and

Whereas the expansion of the domestic production of sugar should be encouraged as a problem of national economy and defense; the acute shortage of sugar during the World War demonstrated our need for a much higher domestic sugar production in time of emergency; and

Whereas because of the high altitude of this region there are practically no substitute crops for sugar beets and the restriction of the beet industry means the throttling of our agriculture by eliminating the best cultivated crop in a proper rotation for maintaining soil fertility and weed control; and

Whereas the development of profitable agricultural operations is so vital to the business of all of Montana as well as of the entire United States, and should be given most serious consideration by all individuals and law-making bodies; and

Whereas the Beet Growers' Association of Montana, supported by the Montana Federation of Labor and Montanans, Inc. (the State chamber of commerce), have given serious and careful consideration to the present sugar quotas and the above facts have been definitely established: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the prayer of your memorialists, the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, that the Congress of the United States should, by proper legislation, right the wrong suffered by the farmers, processors, and wage earners engaged in the growing and manufacturing of beet sugar, by immediately raising the domestic sugar quota to permit the unrestricted production of sugar within the continental limits of the United States, and to maintain the protective market by quota reductions and adequate tariffs on foreign sugar; be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives of Montana in Congress.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4218, making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to insert in connection therewith certain excerpts from the proceedings of the American Federation of Labor, and also certain excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a communication I received with respect to the Gilbertsville Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in regard to promotion in the Navy, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a short explanation be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Record my remarks and to include therein both a letter and a sworn statement addressed to me by David Lasser, president of the Workers' Alliance of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, just what is this material about the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The president of the Workers' Alliance was attacked in a transcript of an alleged conversation placed in the Record by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]. I submit that Mr. Lasser's version should go in the Record. It is only fair play to permit it to be inserted.

Mr. FADDIS. Owing to the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] is not present, I will object at present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include therein certain brief excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the exceptional ability of the Right Reverend Joseph M. Corrigan, rector of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a very able eulogy on His Holiness, Pope Pius XI, delivered by him on Wednesday last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address by myself at the Lincoln Day dinner at Charleston, W. Va.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a Lincoln Day address made by the Honorable FOREST A. HARNES on February 14, 1939, at Kokomo, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a memorial received from the Senate of Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein a letter of which I read a portion at that time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address given by myself on Abraham Lincoln, February 13.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BUCK, from February 17 to 21, inclusive, on account of attendance at opening of Golden Gate International Exposition, San Francisco, Calif.

To Mr. HAVENNER, for 1 week, on account of official business.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 17, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will continue Friday, February 17, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, February 17, 1939. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill.

##### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on Friday, February 17, 1939, at 2 p. m., for the purpose of continuing the consideration of H. R. 2880, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy

to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," carrying out partially the recommendations of the Hepburn report.

##### COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Friday, February 17, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., to hold hearings on the report on Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and Indian Harbor and Canal, Ind.

##### COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, February 21, 1939.

##### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on the bill (H. R. 3576) to make effective the provisions of the Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

It is contemplated that the hearing on Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on H. R. 3576 will deal particularly with legislation necessary to make effective the provisions of the treaty and problems arising in connection with the provisions of the treaty.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

Tuesday, March 14, 1939:

H. R. 180, H. R. 202, construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201, additional facilities for Panama Canal; H. R. 2667, construction of a Mexican Canal.

In listing the bills to be heard on March 14, 1939, House Joint Resolution 112 (TINKHAM), to create a commission to study and report on the feasibility of constructing the Mexican Canal, was inadvertently omitted from the notice.

This is to advise all interested parties that House Joint Resolution 112 will be considered at that time with the following bills: H. R. 180 (IZAC), relative to the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 202 (BLAND), relative to the construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201 (BLAND), need for additional lock facilities at Panama; H. R. 2667 (TINKHAM), relative to the construction of a Mexican Canal.

Tuesday, March 21, 1939:

H. R. 137, H. R. 980, H. R. 1674, relating to annuities for Panama Canal construction force.

Thursday, March 23, 1939:

H. R. 139, H. R. 141, H. R. 142, H. R. 1819, miscellaneous Panama Canal bills.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

424. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a report on H. R. 2261, a bill to restore two former policemen to duty and to set aside the decision of the trial board; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

425. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the production of designs, plans, and specifications for public works in the interest of national defense; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

426. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of legislation passed by the Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

427. A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting a correction in the annual report of the Capital Transit Co. for 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

428. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize necessary facilities for the Coast Guard in the interest of national defense and the performance of its maritime police functions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.



429. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1939 aggregating \$321,700 and a legislative proviso affecting existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

430. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of \$1,125,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to remain available until expended, for the War Department, for development of rotary wing and other aircraft authorized by the act approved June 30, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 156); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

431. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations amounting to \$155,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to remain available until expended, for the Panama Canal, for completion, within the Canal Zone, of a memorial to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals (H. Doc. No. 158); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

432. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Maritime Labor Board for the fiscal year 1939, amounting to \$30,000 (H. Doc. No. 159); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

433. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1933 in the sum of \$91.67, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1939 and 1940 in the sum of \$57,067, amounting in all to \$57,158.67, and two drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

434. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provision effecting the appropriation for the War Department for Army transportation (H. Doc. No. 162); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

435. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1939, amounting to \$985,000, together with two drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

436. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a provision of legislation pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1939 (H. Doc. No. 164); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

437. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the Post Office Department to provide funds required under certain appropriations to meet deficiencies or additional requirements for the fiscal years 1937, 1938, and 1939, aggregating \$951,000 (H. Doc. No. 166); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

438. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1938 in the sum of \$46,500, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1939 and 1940 in the sum of \$2,151,000, amounting in all to \$2,197,500, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 167); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

439. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision affecting an existing appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1939, under the heading "International Production Control Committee" (H. Doc. No. 168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

440. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Board of Tax Appeals for the fiscal year 1939 in

the sum of \$12,000 (H. Doc. No. 169); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

441. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year 1939 amounting to \$325,000 (H. Doc. No. 170); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

442. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1939 amounting to \$5,381,950 (H. Doc. No. 171); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

443. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year 1939 amounting to \$365,000 (H. Doc. No. 172); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

444. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 14, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Connecticut River between Hartford, Conn., and Springfield and Holyoke, Mass., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted August 23, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4218. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3655. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931; with amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 153. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over commercial prints and labels, for the purpose of copyright registration, to the Register of Copyrights; without amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'LEARY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2382. A bill to amend section 704 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, and to amend section 706 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; with amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 323. An act for the relief of E. C. Beaver, who suffered loss on account of the Lawton, Okla., fire, 1917; with amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 309. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 312. A bill for the relief of Roland P. Winstead; with amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 329. A bill for the relief of R. L. Scott; without amendment

(Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 727. A bill for the relief of Charles Dancause and Virginia P. Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 728. A bill for the relief of Catherine Ward; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 743. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzey, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzey and Sarah C. Stuff; without amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Weisenberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 838. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Ray E. Nies; with amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Floyd Gattton; with amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1183. A bill for the relief of Ben L. Kessinger and M. Carlisle Minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1229. A bill for the relief of Edwin L. Wade; with amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1279. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Italian Star Line, Inc., against the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1363. A bill for the relief of George Houston; with amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1429. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1430. A bill for the relief of Hyman Ginsberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1836. A bill for the relief of Jack Nelson; with amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of Nell Mullen; with amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1907. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lawrence Chlebeck; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of Joseph Sciortino; with amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2098. A bill for the relief of Katherine Patterson; without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of S. Uttal; with amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Russell Anderegg, a minor, and George W. Anderegg; with amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2356. A bill for the relief of the International Grain Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3082. A bill for the relief of Frank Gedney; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 704) granting a pension to John B. Ellis; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2486) granting a pension to George Austin; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2500) granting a pension to Colonel L. Stacy; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2502) granting a pension to Arvil Roberts; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2503) granting a pension to Harrison Lykins; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2506) granting a pension to Perry Osborne; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2507) granting a pension to Stephen Hays; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2579) granting a pension to Thomas G. Solosky; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4219. A bill to reclassify salaries of employees in the custodial service of the Post Office Department and in the custodial service of the Treasury Department and the custodial service of the Department of the Interior of the United States, including all positions therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4220. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1492), entitled "An act to establish load lines for American vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 4221. A bill to provide that the benefits of the naturalization laws shall not be denied any person because of his having received relief from a governmental agency; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4222. A bill authorizing special-delivery messengers to be covered into the classified civil service as substitute clerks and carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 4223. A bill extending the classified civil service to include special-delivery messengers; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4224. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



By Mr. PIERCE of Oregon:

H. R. 4225. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, with respect to orders and marketing agreements for hops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4226. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States in establishing and developing demonstration centers in adult civic education during a 3-year period; to the Committee on Education.

H. R. 4227. A bill extending the classified executive civil service of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 4228 (by departmental request). A bill to authorize the Director of the Geological Survey, under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, to acquire certain collections for the United States; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4229. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the Commonwealth of Virginia a portion of the naval reservation known as Quantico in Prince William County, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4230. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the Commonwealth of Virginia of certain parcels of property in Fairfax, Warwick, Princess Anne, Prince George, and Roanoke Counties, Va., which are now portions of certain military reservations used for highway purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THORKELSON:

H. R. 4231. A bill for the construction of a fish hatchery at Lima, in Beaverhead County, Mont.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4232. A bill to limit the traffic in war munitions, to promote peace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 4233. A bill relating to certain entries for stock-raising homesteads; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 4234. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands adjacent to national forests in Adams and Valley Counties, Idaho; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4235. A bill to establish a United States Court of Appeals for Administration to receive, decide, and expedite appeals from Federal commissions, administrative authorities, and tribunals, in which the United States is a party or has an interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4236. A bill to provide for the more expeditious settlement of disputes with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS:

H. R. 4237. A bill authorizing payment of the burial expenses and expenses in connection with last illness and death of native employees dying while serving in offices abroad of executive departments of the United States Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 4238. A bill for the purpose of encouraging and fostering the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce in the United States by providing for a student-pilot training program and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 4239. A bill to provide automobile liability for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 4240. A bill to provide for the relief of the Catawba Indians in South Carolina; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 4241. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended by the acts of July 3, 1926, and

February 27, 1931, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 4242. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HARNESS:

H. R. 4243. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Peru, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 4244. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. R. 4245. A bill to authorize a modification of the project for local flood protection at East Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4246. A bill to authorize necessary facilities for the Coast Guard in the interest of national defense and the performance of its maritime police functions; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Hamann; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BALL:

H. R. 4248. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clara Prentiss Billard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTON:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Stephen Kelen; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of Emma H. Ridley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4251. A bill for the relief of Chazkiel (or Charles) Lewkowski; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 4252. A bill for the relief of J. George Bense Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Arthur Weiss; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4254. A bill granting a pension to Henry M. Tunis; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4255. A bill granting a pension to Mary A. Beemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON of New Jersey:

H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of the estate of George B. Spearin, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 4257. A bill for the relief of the estate of Bartholomew Lawler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 4258. A bill granting a pension to Ella F. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4259. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 4260. A bill for the relief of J. Milton Sweney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4261. A bill for the relief of Maude Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4262. A bill for the relief of Santo Giannetto; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4263. A bill for the relief of Domenico Spinelli; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4264. A bill for the relief of Corabell Wuensch, Jackie Lee Wuensch, and Mary Rainbolt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 4265. A bill for the relief of Rachel or Rochel Bursk; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 4266. A bill granting a pension to Matilda Roach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PIERCE of Oregon:

H. R. 4267. A bill for the relief of the Lamm Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4268. A bill for the relief of the Algoma Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4269. A bill for the relief of the Forest Lumber Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 4270. A bill for the relief of Cecilia Niland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4271. A bill granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Gutting; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. R. 4272. A bill for the relief of Jessica J. Armour; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THORKELOSON:

H. R. 4273. A bill for the relief of Lu Knowles Maxey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM:

H. R. 4274. A bill for the relief of Nick Marsoobian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4275. A bill for the relief of Harry Vrontas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARREN:

H. R. 4276. A bill granting an increase of pension to Estelle Rose Simmons; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4277. A bill for the relief of Paul Little; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1131. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of Oneida (Ill.) Townsend Club, No. 1, urging the committee to report out House bill 2; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1132. By Mr. CURLEY: Resolution of the New York State Council of Parks, opposing claims of the Government to the ownership of lands under tidal waters of the State of New York or any other State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1133. By Mr. EATON of New Jersey: Resolution adopted by the mayor and Council of the Borough of North Plainfield, opposing enactment of proposed legislation to make municipal bonds subject to Federal tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1134. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Gerald Schooley, of New Haven, Ind., and 100 residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., stating that they are not in favor of changing the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Labor.

1135. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society, Logansport, Ind., favoring legislation for control of the motion-picture industry, and urging that hearings be held thereon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1136. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the King's Daughters of Christian Church, Brook, Ind., favoring legislation for control of the motion-picture industry, and urging that hearings be held thereon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1137. By Mr. HART: Petition of St. Patrick's Holy Name Society of St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church of Jersey

City, N. J., expressing opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1138. Also, petition of the 64 priests of St. Michael's Monastery, Union City, N. J., expressing a protest against the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1139. Also, petition of the New Jersey Catholic Daughters of America, numbering 15,000, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their desire to keep the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1140. Also, petition of St. Michael's High School Alumni of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1141. Also, petition of Rev. Fr. Dominic J. Del Monte and the members of the Catholic War Veterans of Our Lady of Libera Post, No. 150, West New York, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1142. Also, petition of Rev. Walter A. Hennessey, pastor, and parishioners of the Immaculate Conception Roman Catholic Church, Secaucus, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1143. Also, petition of the members of St. Joseph's Benevolent Society, St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, Union City, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1144. Also, petition of the Keep the Spanish Embargo Committee, opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1145. Also, petition of the Young Men's Independent Club of West New York, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1146. Also, petition of the members of the Guild of Catholic Lawyers of the Archdiocese of Newark, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1147. Also, petition of Rev. Thomas F. Burke, pastor, and parishioners of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1148. Also, petition of the Federation of Holy Name Societies, Essex Division, Newark, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1149. Also, petition of the Hudson County, N. J., board of directors, Ancient Order of Hibernians of America, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1150. Also, petition of Rev. LeRoy E. McWilliams and the members of St. Michael's Holy Name Society of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church of Jersey City, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1151. Also, petition of Rev. James A. Mackinson and parishioners of St. John's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City,



N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1152. Also, petition of Rev. Walter P. Artioli, pastor, and parishioners of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1153. Also, petition of Rev. William J. Carlin, pastor, and 4,000 parishioners of St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1154. Also, petition of Rev. A. Auth, pastor, and the parishioners of St. Nicholas' Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1155. Also, petition of Right Rev. R. J. Byer, rector, and parishioners of St. Augustine Roman Catholic Church, Union City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1156. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Nicholas' Church, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1157. Also, petition of Rev. A. V. Dunn and parishioners of St. Anne's Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, N. J., expressing their opposition to the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1158. Also, petition of the members of Hoboken Council, No. 159, Knights of Columbus, Hoboken, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1159. Also, petition of the members of the New Jersey State Council, Knights of Columbus, and Thomas C. Madigan, State advocate, Belmar, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1160. Also, petition of the instructresses of St. Nicholas' School, St. Nicholas' Roman Catholic Church, Jersey City, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1161. Also, petition of the members of Paulus Hook Council, No. 475, Knights of Columbus, Jersey City, N. J., opposing the repeal of the joint resolution imposing an embargo on the shipment of war materials to either party of the Spanish civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1162. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Sadie Hammett, secretary, Local No. 730, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 3812; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1163. Also, petition of Rev. J. M. Youree, Hillsboro, Tex., opposing amending Social Security Act so as to include disabled and retired ministers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1164. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the State Council of Parks, New York City, concerning any claim of the Government of the United States to the ownership of the lands under tidal waters of the State of New York or any other State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1165. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Woodcrest Democratic Club of Los Angeles, relative to the preservation of

the Redwood Mountain area of big trees under national-park status; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1166. Also, resolution of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, relative to the enactment of legislation to secure all aged citizens against want or poverty by means of a system of Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1167. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Marie E. Mock, Joliet, Ill., and 17 interested persons, recommending the adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1168. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Petition of the Woman's Foreign Missionary Societies of Kalamazoo and Vicksburg, Mich., protesting against exportation of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1169. By Mr. THORKE: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the passage of the legislation for the creation and establishment of the Townsend recovery plan, and for benefits to be paid to all persons over the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1170. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Rev. E. V. Headen, Pinellas Park, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to churches of America under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the fountain of wisdom, whose statutes are good and gracious, and whose law of beauty in the universe reveals by night and day, in rhythmic folds, the streaming robe of an eternal glory: Descend to meet us on our upward way that we may learn the law that is Thy kingdom here on earth, our way of freedom, and our path to Thee.

Guide and direct the thoughts and aspirations of Thy servants here, that in the deliberations of this day they may ordain for the governance of our Nation only such things as shall please Thee, to the glory of Thy name and the safety, honor, and welfare of our people; that justice and truth being established among us we may lead the nations of the world into that enduring peace which alone is the fruit of righteousness. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 16, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	King	Russell
Andrews	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Ashurst	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Austin	Frazier	Logan	Sheppard
Bailey	George	Lucas	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gerry	Lundeen	Smathers
Barbour	Gibson	McKellar	Smith
Barkley	Gillette	McNary	Stewart
Bone	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Green	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Tobey
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Hill	Pepper	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Pittman	Wheeler
Connally	Hughes	Radcliffe	White
Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	